

MARY C. SULLIVAN

RELIGIOUS EDUCATION

A PLATFORM FOR THE FREE DISCUSSION OF
ISSUES IN THE FIELD OF RELIGION AND
THEIR BEARING ON EDUCATION

JULY - AUGUST 1955



RELIGION IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS
A Symposium

Religious Education

Official Publication of the Religious Education Association

Seeks to present, on an adequate, scientific plane, those factors which make for improvement in religious and moral education. The Journal does not defend particular points of view, contributors alone being responsible for opinions expressed in their articles. It gives its authors entire freedom of expression, without any official endorsement. Articles in Religious Education are indexed in the EDUCATION INDEX which is on file in educational institutions and public libraries.

Membership in the Association is \$5.00 or more per year.
Single copies of Religious Education, \$1.00 each.

HERMAN E. WORNOM, General Secretary, 545 West 111th Street, New York 25, N. Y.

LEONARD A. STIDLEY, Editor
Oberlin College,
Oberlin, Ohio

EDITORIAL COMMITTEE

LEONARD A. STIDLEY, Dean and Professor of Religious Education, Graduate School of Theology, Oberlin College, Oberlin, Ohio, Chairman.

ALVIN J. COOPER, Board of Education, United Church of Canada, Toronto.

EMMA FRANK, Librarian, Graduate School of Theology, Oberlin College, Oberlin, Ohio.

EMANUEL GAMORAN, Commission on Jewish Education, New York City.

LEO HONOR, Professor of Education, Dropsie College for Hebrew and Cognate Learning, Philadelphia, Pa.

THOMAS S. KEPLER, Professor of New Testament, Graduate School of Theology, Oberlin College, Oberlin, Ohio.

HERBERT G. MAY, Professor of Old Testament, Graduate School of Theology, Oberlin College, Oberlin, Ohio.

ROBERT MICHAELSON, Director, School of Religion, State University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa.

GERARD S. SLOYAN, Department of Religious Education, The Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C.

LEO WARD, Professor of Philosophy, Notre Dame University, Notre Dame, Indiana.

The Religious Education Association

General Secretary and Business Office, 545 W. 111th Street,
New York 25, N. Y.

Editorial and Publication Office, 29 N. Pleasant St., Oberlin, Ohio

Printed at 48 S. Main Street, Oberlin, Ohio

Published bi-monthly. Printed in the U. S. A.

RELIGIOUS EDUCATION

VOLUME I

JULY - AUGUST, 1955

NUMBER 4

CONTENTS

	Page
Religion in the Public Schools — A Symposium	
I A Proposed Program for Achieving the Role of Religion in Education ----- <i>William Clayton Bower</i>	211
II Religion and Public Education — A Personalist View ----- <i>Charles Donabue</i>	219
III A Workshop on Religion in the Public Schools ----- <i>Arthur Gilbert</i>	225
IV Religion in Public Education ----- <i>American Jewish Committee</i>	232
V Religion in Teacher Education ----- <i>Eugene E. Dawson</i>	238
VI Teaching Spiritual Values in the Public Schools ----- <i>Herbert F. A. Smith</i>	243
Three Levels of Value in Religious Education ----- <i>Harland E. Hogue</i>	247
Prayer and Worship Re-examined ----- <i>Ross Snyder</i>	253
The Indiana Plan for Religious Adult Education ----- <i>Paul Bergevin</i>	257
Significant Evidence ----- <i>Ernest M. Ligon and William A. Koppe</i>	262
Book Reviews -----	265
Book Notes -----	270

CHANGE OF ADDRESS

Please notify RELIGIOUS EDUCATION, 545 West 111th Street, New York 25, N. Y., of change of address, giving both old and new addresses.

Send notification of change of address at least four weeks in advance.

The United States Post Office does not automatically forward second class matter.

Entered as second-class matter, January 23, 1948, at the Post Office at Oberlin, Ohio, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

PROGRAM DEVELOPMENTS

The Religious Education Association deals with those basic problems of religious education and of the place of religion in American education and culture which affect the work of all religious and educational agencies. In pursuit of this policy the national program of the Association is currently concentrating on four strategic areas:

- (1) The responsibility of higher education for Judeo-Christian values in American culture;
- (2) The need for greatly increasing research in religious education and the potential of the social sciences for aiding this research;
- (3) The value patterns and effects of the mass media, especially television, vis-a-vis our religious values and the effects of religious education;
- (4) The relation of religion and philosophy of education.

Five groups of outstanding scholars and educational leaders, two for higher education and one for each of the other three areas, are in various stages of conducting programs or explorations in the four areas.

The work in higher education is crucial. Religion is a second or third class or non-existent department in the institutions of higher learning in which more than 75 per cent of all students are enrolled. Even in many church related colleges, Catholic and Protestant, departments of chemistry or English or history, for example, rate in scholarship, budgets and majors well above departments of religion. If the future leadership of America is to have a mature intellectual understanding of religion, the position of religion in higher education must be enhanced.

The R. E. A. has held during the past academic year two regional conferences (New York City and Chicago) of representatives of church related and independent universities for the purpose of identifying and analyzing the problems (philosophic, methodological and administrative) which are central to improving the status and effectiveness of religion in higher education. In cooperation with the University of Minnesota, the Association has sponsored two conferences on the place of religion in the curricula of state universities and colleges in the Mid-West. Out of all four conferences have come recommendations for extensive research and study in the future and the R. E. A. is taking steps to implement these recommendations. The next issue of RELIGIOUS EDUCATION will be on religion and higher education and will publish a number of papers presented at these conferences and a statement of issues recommended for further study.

Research in religious education, as compared with public education, has never been extensive. Excepting two or three centers, no major research enterprise in religious education has been undertaken for 25 years. Meanwhile the social sciences have been making important progress in developing approaches and methods to research in values and moral behavior which might be invaluable to research in religion education. It is of strategic importance that religious leaders and social scientists know each other and work together.

This past May the R. E. A.'s Committee on Research held a small one-day pilot conference of fifteen religious educators with five social scientists who are engaged in research in value formation or religious experience.

Our Board of Directors have authorized holding a larger and longer conference on research during the coming season.

There is not space to report here on the work of the Committees on the Mass Media and on Religion and Philosophy of Education. Both of these groups are planning for valuable conferences or projects which will be reported on in later issues of our Journal.

HERMAN E. WORNAM
General Secretary
Religious Education Association

A Symposium

RELIGION IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Many different groups in our pluralistic culture are seeking light upon the complex and continuing problem of the place of religion in the public schools.

The six articles of this symposium throw much light upon significant developments in the field.

—THE EDITORIAL COMMITTEE

I

A Proposed Program FOR ACHIEVING THE ROLE OF RELIGION IN EDUCATION¹

WILLIAM CLAYTON BOWER

Emeritus Professor of Religious Education, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.

I

THE FOLLOWING proposal is made against the background of a growing concern over the restoration of the value content in contemporary education.

This concern has grown in considerable degree out of the secularization of education. The early schools in America were religious in content, spirit, and personnel. In the nineteenth century, as the result of the interaction of several factors, chief among which was the sectarianism of religion in America, religion was excluded from the public schools, and the principle of the separation of church and state in education was firmly established by the last quarter of the century.

We are now living with the results of that decision—results that were neither intended nor anticipated. As a consequence, we have a secularized public school system. The primary emphasis has shifted to knowledge and techniques, there has been a decline in ethical standards and sanctions, and, lacking the unifying element which a system of values can give, there has been a fragmentation of culture and of personal life.

Manifestations of this growing concern on the part of public school leaders are to be found in the Yearbook of the National Education Association for 1932 which stated the problem in terms of character development in which the function of religion was emphasized, in the 1944 Yearbook of the John Dewey Society where the specific problem was analyzed with reference to the role of religion, in the publication in 1947 of *The Relation of Religion to Public Education* by the American Council on Education in which in a forthright manner it was advocated that religion as an aspect of culture should be incorporated into the public schools, and in the publication in 1950 by the Commission on Educational Policies of *Moral and Spiritual Values in the Public Schools* in which the Commission took the position that functional religious values, as distinguished from their theological interpretations, not only could legally be included in the program of the school, but that it was the obligation of the school so to do.

Thus far two types of approach to this problem have been proposed. One is that proposed in Clarence Linton's *The Function of the Public Schools in Dealing with Religion* (1953), a report of a study carried on under the auspices of the Committee on

¹An elaboration of a presentation at the Berea Kentucky, Conference, the "Role of Religion in the Public Schools." October 18, 1954.

Religion in Education of the American Council on Education. This proposal is that the factual study of religion (earlier designated as "the study about religion") be added to the curriculum of the public schools.

The other is that of the Kentucky Program for the Discovery and Development of Moral and Spiritual Values as these are involved in the relations and functions of the school as a community of persons and as they appear in the cultural heritage — literature, history, science, philosophy, the social studies, and the arts. The Kentucky Program proposes the addition of no new subject matter to the curriculum, but the diffusion of emphasis upon moral and spiritual values throughout the entire program of the school in relation to the activities of the school community and the treatment of the subject matters of the curriculum. It is designed to develop sensitivity on the part of supervisors, teachers, and pupils to these values when and as they are encountered in the total educational process, to identify and develop them in the actual experience of living, and to render them effective in the judging of types of behavior and in making commitments that are carried beyond verbalization into action.

II

These different approaches raise certain fundamental issues:

1. *What is meant by "religion"?*

In America there are more than 250 religious faiths and Protestant sects, each with its distinctive theological and ecclesiastical beliefs and practices. It is safe to say that for the most part religion is more or less identified with the beliefs and practices of the faith or denomination to which a given person belongs. Thus religion tends to mean as many different things as there are different faiths and sects. This is the theological-ecclesiastical interpretation of religion. It is the basis of the sectarian conception of religion in America. It was this sectarianism arising from wide divergences of theological and ecclesiastical interpretation of religion that led to its exclusion

from public education in the nineteenth century.

The other conception of religion is functional. In keeping with the trend resulting from the scientific study of religion during the last three-quarters of a century, it conceives of religion as a valuational attitude growing out of man's experience in his interaction with his natural, social, and cosmic world. Its essential character lies in the fact that it is a revaluation of all the values involved in the living process by which the specialized values, such as economic, political, intellectual, social, ethical, and aesthetic values, are integrated and heightened into a total meaning and worth of life in its responsible relation to reality.

This functional relation of religion as the revaluation of values to personal and social experience is two-fold and reciprocal. On the one hand, a people's religious beliefs and practices are derived from their practical interests and activities. This is why they differ from one cultural group to another, as in Egypt, Assyria, Palestine, Greece, and India. It is also why they differ from one time to another within a given culture as the practical interests and activities of the group change, as in the case of the growth of the idea of God among the ancient Hebrews or the development of the doctrine of the Atonement in Western Europe.

On the other hand, once this integration and transformation of values has been achieved, it re-enters personal and social experience as a factor of cross-criticism and reconstruction, as when an exploitative, profit-motive economic system is brought under the criticism of scientific knowledge, social attitudes, political consequences, and moral and aesthetic ideals. Thus, vital and functional religion is forever creating tensions between existing personal and social behavior and resolving these tensions on the highest level of comprehending and transcendent values.

From the functional point of view, religion is a *quality* that potentially attaches to any and every experience arising out of man's interaction with his natural, social, and cosmic world. A person or group is

religious to the extent that each response to situations is judged and carried through in the light of these supreme and comprehending values; they are irreligious to the extent that these situations are responded to without regard to these supreme and comprehensive values or in violation of them.

Religion theologically and ecclesiastically interpreted cannot legally be taught in the public schools. Quite aside from the matter of legality, an attempt to do so would quite certainly put us back in the days of Horace Mann and again close the doors of the schools to a religious content of education. And once that happened, it would be long before they would be opened again. But functional moral and spiritual values without theological interpretation, as the Educational Policies Commission has pointed out, not only can be included in the program of the school but unquestionably should be in the interests of growing persons, society, and good education.

2. *What Shall Be the Objectives?*

The two types of approach have essentially different objectives. In proposing the introduction of a factual study of religion into the curriculum, the Committee on Religion and Education of the American Council on Education, as carried forward in Dr. Linton's proposal, is two-fold:

(1) "The public school should assist youth to have an intelligent understanding of the historical and contemporary role of religion in human affairs," and (2) "The public school should stimulate the young toward a vigorous personal reaction to the challenge of religion." Clearly, the first objective is to give knowledge about religion. This objective would seem to be clearly within the function of the public school and to be consistent with the principle of the separation of church and state. But the legitimacy of the second objective to secure commitment is open to grave question. Personal religious commitments under the conditions of sectarian religion in America tend by their nature to be predominantly to specific beliefs and practices and to be canalized in terms of theological and ecclesiastical traditions, such as Jesus as Savior and

Lord, (Protestant), the authority and infallibility of the Pope and devotion to Mary the Mother of God (Roman Catholic), and The Chosen People (Jewish). These would seem to be matters that lie clearly within the function of the several churches and synagogues. Moreover, teaching for commitment strongly tends to involve persuasion, if not propaganda. For these reasons the second objective is judged not to be consistent with the first and inevitably to involve in practice a considerable degree of sectarianism.

On the other hand, the program for the Discovery and Development of Moral and Spiritual Values is concerned, not primarily with subject-matter, but with the moral and spiritual growth of persons through the actual experience of these values in the interpretation and control of living. It is concerned that the emphasis upon these values should be diffused throughout the entire school and the learning process through the sensitivity of teachers and administrators and pupils in every phase of school life—the relations and activities of the school as a community of persons and the moral and spiritual content of the several subject-matter fields, such as literature, history, the social studies, philosophy, science, and the arts.

And it should be noted that when a revaluation of these values is achieved through a philosophy of life, a hierarchy of values involved in practical living, the formation of purposive behavior patterns, and commitment of self-chosen ends in the light of these values, the learning experience takes on a profound and creative religious quality, without theological or ecclesiastical interpretation. If the several faiths and denominations feel that such theological and ecclesiastical interpretations should be added, that is clearly the responsibility of the churches and not of the school.

3. *What is Meant by "The Factual Study of Religion?"*

Religion is a very complex personal and social phenomenon, and presumably a "factual study of religion," unless clearly defined, would include all such facts—historical,

theological, liturgical, ecclesiastical, literary, symbolic. Besides being an assignment beyond the capacity of most teachers, dealing with certain of these types of "factual" study would not only lie beyond the proper function of the public school, but would be objectionable. Doubtless many, like myself, who would favor the study of religion as an aspect of culture, historical and contemporary, would be opposed to an introduction of the "factual" study of religion in the ample sense outlined above as invading the distinctive function of the churches and as needlessly introducing a sectarian element into the schools.

4. *What Procedure is to be Used?*

If the end is to give the pupils a knowledge about religion, it would seem clear that some form of transmissive technique is indicated, through the processes of instruction. But if the end is to be the moral and spiritual growth of persons and commitment, then creative learning functionally related to the experiences of growing persons is indicated — facing life situation, judging and choosing between alternative outcomes, making decisions that are carried beyond verbalization to action, and the cumulative building up of a hierarchy of values, a philosophy of life and dependable habit patterns through making value judgements in actual experience.

In this connection, it is immensely important that we be on guard against the wide-spread educational fallacy that "knowledge about" religious values will automatically result in commitment and changed behavior — a fallacy that has been demonstrated by many objective tests.

III

From the beginning, it has been the conviction of the Kentucky Program that any complete education should take account of religion. In the development of the Kentucky Program this interest has currently emerged as a matter for exploration and experimentation. The workshop at the University of Kentucky during the past summer devoted itself especially to how religion may be dealt with in the school program.

To this end, the Kentucky Program has made the following six proposals:

1. The school should provide the growing person with actual experience of moral and spiritual values as they arise in the relations and activities of the school as a community and in dealing with the subject-matters of the curriculum — literature, history, science, the social studies, philosophy, and the arts.

2. The school should give the pupil an understanding of the functional relation of religion to the development of historical and contemporary culture. This might well assume the form of a formal course on the religious aspects of culture.

3. The school should create respect for the various forms of religious beliefs and practices through an understanding of the historical and social conditions under which they have arisen.

4. Through visitation and observation the school should give the pupil an understanding and appreciation of the expressions and operations of religion in the local community.

5. As far as possible, the school should help to avoid conflict between the scientific views taught in the schools and the theological beliefs and practices of the various churches. People live by their values, and these should be conserved.

6. Through giving the pupil actual experience of moral and spiritual values and through an understanding of the functional relation of religion to personal and social experience, the school should lay the foundation for what the churches feel they should add in the way of theological and ecclesiastical interpretation and the securing of personal commitments to specific religious beliefs, practices, and causes.

IV

The consideration of these problems is especially important because of the potential role of religion, functionally conceived, in education.

Speaking broadly, this role is five-fold. Doubtless members of the several faiths and denominations would wish to add other roles

in terms of their differing theological and ecclesiastical traditions, ranging from the adherents of the Jewish faith through Roman Catholicism and the more or less commonly held beliefs and practices of Protestant denominations, to those profoundly religious persons who, like Abraham Lincoln, could accept no orthodox or sectarian theology. With these theologically and ecclesiastically determined ends and means the public school cannot properly be concerned, though it may not assume the right to pass judgment upon their validity. But the five-fold role of functional religion, which is universal and underlies all historical and contemporary religious forms, is not only the legitimate concern of the public school, but essential to any complete education that has to do with the growth of persons. This five-fold role may be stated somewhat as follows:

1. Its contribution to the value content of education.

This is the point at which contemporary American education is most lacking. As suggested above, the primary emphasis in American education has shifted to knowledge and techniques. This has resulted in a deficit in value content which has led to an imbalance in education. This imbalance is in desperate need of being redressed. Notwithstanding the potential value content of all subject-matters, it may be said that there are three sources that are particularly rich in values. They are art, morals, and religion.

The various forms of art—literature, poetry, music, drama, painting, sculpture, architecture—are not primarily concerned with knowledge or technique but with values, with reference to which knowledge and technique are means. At their best, they are not only expressions of the meanings of life, but are also criticisms of life in terms of its ideal qualities—the good, the beautiful, and the true. Without these values human life, however intelligent and technically efficient, is cold, empty, and meaningless.

As to morals, no human being lives to himself alone. He is caught up in an intricate mesh of relations to his fellowmen. Personality is a social phenomenon from birth itself through every phase of living.

This net-work of relationships involves innumerable moral judgments as to what is right and what is wrong, together with immense responsibilities for the maintenance of standards of conduct. The good life, as Henry Churchill King once pointed out, consists essentially in the right discernment of these relations and their right fulfillment. These judgments and these ways of behaving rest upon human values.

But it is to functional religion which by its nature is a valuational experience that we must look as the supreme source of values. It is concerned, not only with particular values in the varied areas of living such as economic, intellectual, social, political, esthetic, and moral, but with the whole of life—with its meaning and worth in relation to total reality.

2. Its contribution to the integration of personality and of society.

As the revaluation of all the particular values involved in living, functional religion brings the varied and often conflicting interests and activities of personal and social life to a vivid focus and integrates what otherwise would be fragmented experiences into a meaningful whole. Under the influence of such highly specialized activities as scientific inquiry, technology, and industry, personal and social life in the modern world has tended to fall apart. And with its falling apart life has lost its sense of wholeness and convincing meaning. Modern man is suffering from a sense of isolation, disillusionment, futility, and pessimism, all destructive to personal and social integrity. This all-too-prevalent attitude is reflected by an extreme case reported some years ago by Professor Otto. To an inquiry addressed to his students, one young man replied that life for him had lost all meaning and worth. In a desperate attempt to find some sense of wholeness he had turned to philosophy, adding that if he failed to find it there or in religion his only alternative was—suicide. In this *Modern Man in Search of a Soul* Dr. C. G. Jung confirmed this mood on a wider scale.

One important reason for the effectiveness of functional religion in achieving integration lies in the fact that its values are practical rather than theoretical, as in the case of phi-

losophy. The values of religion are goals of actual living—the ends of striving and action.

But the chief integrating influence of religion arises from the fact that in the deepest sense it involves commitment to self-chosen ends. It is a well recognized fact that nothing so unifies the self and society as wholehearted devotion to emotionally felt ends or causes. In religion this devotion is rooted in the revaluation of all the practical interests and activities of living into a total meaning and worth of life in relation to total reality. In the classical language of all historic religions this reality, however, intellectually interpreted, is represented by the word God, the most heavily freighted word in human language.

3. The creation and resolution of tension between the actual and the ideal.

Functional religion not only integrates all values of living into a total meaning and worth of life, but it subjects all particular interests and activities to searching criticism in the light of that total meaning and worth in responsible relation to God. The result is constant tension between attitudes and behaviors as they actually are and as they ought to be. Improvement in attitudes and behavior, as we know, depends upon sensitivity to defects in one's way of living as brought to light by projected and desired ideals. This tension has been rightly characterized as "the divine discontent," which is at the root of all striving for the good life.

But vital, functioning religion is as much concerned with resolving these tensions as with creating them. It achieves resolution through the redirection of desires on the level of higher moral and spiritual values in somewhat radical contrast with much psychiatric procedure which seeks "adjustment" for its own sake on any level of undisciplined desire. This alternation of tension and resolution provides the indispensable conditions for the continuous moral and spiritual growth of persons toward the highest self-realization.

4. The giving of a new dimension to human life by setting it in the perspective of eternity and an unimaginably extended universe.

It is not true, as suggested by the title of a book of a few years past, that *Earth is Enough*. The earth as the immediate scene of man's existence is but an infinitesimal particle in a vast universe whose forces impinge upon us at every moment. Brief as is the span of a human life, it is a segment of unending time that in its immensity assumes the dimension of eternity. This universe, much more than our little earth with its limited time span, is man's eternal home. He was born within it, and from it he cannot escape—not even by death. One whose perspective is foreshortened to the immediate earthly scene and the immediate passing moment of time lives superficially and in the midst of harassing uncertainty and anxiety. He who lives his span of life as a moment of eternity and as an integral part of the vast universe of reality finds life taking on a dignity and meaning unknown to a lost soul groping his uncertain way through the tortuous and dimly lighted ways of a merely earthly existence. With such a consciousness of being part and parcel of the universe set in endless time fear gives place to wholehearted acceptance of and reverence for life and to a "peace that passes understanding" in the presence of which even death, like birth, maturing, and decline, is a normal event in the process of living.

5. The motivation of human behavior.

As Dr. W. W. Charters some years ago pointed out, one of the most difficult problems of character education is to get children and young people to do what they know they ought to do but which they do not want to do. The problem as thus stated rests upon a fatal separation of knowledge and action. Therefore, the resort to the external incentives of fear, rewards, and punishment.

When learning what is good is united with desire for realizing the good through guidance in facing actual situations, weighing possible outcomes, making choices, and seeing them through to fulfillment in action, this dilemma is resolved. The vital and effective incentives to action lie in desire for the fulfillment of self-chosen ends. This places motivation forthrightly in the realm of values. Desire in the living person and the value which attaches to desired ends are

only different aspects of purposive behavior. Such an understanding lays bare the root of motivation in desire as the incentive to action and effort. In such purposive action knowing what one ought to do becomes knowing what one wants to do, thus uniting knowledge and will in the effort to achieve the goals of purposeful living.

The fact that functional religion is a valuational experience involving the practical interests and activities of the entire range of living makes its relation to the motivation of moral behavior at once obvious and impressive. As the revaluation of all values whatsoever, it goes beyond particular experiences and rises to the level of a generalized attitude and purpose, including the desire to become a certain kind of idealized person. This gives to living not only a dynamic quality, but a constant directional control of impulses and desires that are often in conflict and sometimes unworthy.

V

Obviously within the limits of this discussion it is impossible to deal in detail with specific techniques for implementing the role of religion in education. It may be useful, however, to set forth some fundamental principles of procedure and to suggest where to look for these values in the activities and relations of the school as a community and in the various subject-matters of the curriculum.

First of all, there are certain simple but basic principles that should be carefully observed:

1. Moralizing, exhortation, and "preaching" are neither necessary nor desirable. They are apt to do more harm than good.

2. The teacher should be careful not to identify his own particular religious beliefs or practices, or that of the religious body to which he belongs, with religion in its universal and functional aspects.

3. The teacher should not allow himself to be drawn into theological or ecclesiastical interpretations and controversy. His attitude toward such matters, which are the concern of the churches and synagogues, should be entirely objective and impartial.

4. The teacher should not in any way seek

to persuade his students to accept his own or any particular system of beliefs and practices. His responsibility is concerned with understanding and appreciation of all points of view, but never with propaganda.

One of the most fruitful sources of functional religious values lies in the many-sided relations and activities of the school as a community of persons, such as administration, social activities, discipline, playground and lunchroom, and athletics. This is a source most commonly overlooked by both administrators and teachers. These relations involve decisions as to what is right and wrong, respect for persons, and the common good. In his role as counselor, the teacher should help children and young people to analyze the situation for its essential factors, to take account of possible alternative courses of action, to search out resources for understanding the nature of the situation and its outcomes, to weigh alternatives in the light of moral and spiritual values, to make their own decisions, and to carry them out in conduct. From the standpoint of religion, the counselor's chief emphasis should be upon values in understanding situations and in making decisions about them. The teacher may not feel it necessary always to identify these values as religious; it is sufficient that they are present and operative. The fact, not the label, is important.

The great traditions of the cultural heritage which constitute the subject-matters of the curriculum are rich in religious content. The discovery and effective use of religious values is not so much a matter of formal techniques as of the sensitivity of teachers to such values and of their good sense in handling them when and as they appear as a normal part of the subject-matter. A preliminary analysis of the subject-matter of a given field will help the teacher to locate these values and guide the children and young people in becoming sensitive to them.

It may suffice in this brief discussion to give some indication of the possibilities of religious values in the several subject-matters.

1. Literature is replete with religious values. They are obvious in the allusions to the Bible and other religious classics, without an

understanding of which much of our literary heritage cannot be read. Less obvious but even more important are the underlying religious assumptions that underlie the points of view in literature, both positive and negative. Literature is not only a representation and interpretation of human life, but in its highest form a criticism of it. Such interpretation and criticism are founded upon criteria which involve a judgment of values. Perhaps no subject more completely reflects the values that are operative in the experience of persons and in society of a given period than the literature deposited by that experience.

2. No teaching of history can be considered adequate that does not take full account of the development of religious ideas and their influence upon the course of events, of religious institutions, and of great religious leaders, together with the influence of religion upon the thought and attitudes of statesmen, reformers, artists, and civic leaders. One cannot understand the Middle Ages, the Renaissance and Reformation of Europe, or the colonial history of America without taking account of the role of religion. As a historian of first magnitude, Arnold Toynbee concludes that history is basically a religious process.

3. Social science, along with anthropology, has long since recognized religion as a fundamental form of collective behavior, and an integral phase of culture. As the late Professor Franklin H. Goodings put it, "religion is man's oldest and most fundamental reaction to his world." Religious institutions, constituencies, patterned activities, ecclesiastical buildings, and organized enterprises are integral parts of contemporary community life, comparable with its economic, social, political, and cultural structures and activities. The sociology of religion has come to be recognized as a discipline within the larger field of general sociology. There is abundant material for a course on the religious aspects of culture, were such a course desired.

4. The sciences have great religious content, though their religious values have too long been overlooked and neglected. Their respect for facts and uncompromising search

for truth, their concepts of an ordered universe, of dependable laws that are amenable to human intelligence and utilization, of the sequence of cause and effect, their use of the experimental method of inquiry, and their exposure of man to the overwhelming mystery—all these are of profound religious significance. It is a notable fact that many of the most significant religious insights have come from modern science, notably physics and biology. Many of the great scientists, such as Kepler, Burbank, Pupin, Compton, and Eddington, have been profoundly religious men, not in spite of science, but because of it. This is also true of mathematics which is one of the chief implements used by science in its understanding of the structure and behavior of nature.

5. The arts—music, the drama, painting, sculpture, architecture, the dance—are particularly replete with religious values, as has been suggested above. All of these have found much of their inspiration and subject-matter in religion, from the cave drawings and artifacts of primitive man down through "The Last Supper" of Leonardo da Vinci, Bach's "German Mass" and Handel's "Messiah" to the great cathedrals of Europe and the still-unfinished Cathedral of St. John the Divine.

In dealing with these great subject-matters, religion should not be "dragged in." It is an integral part of the cultural heritage. It should be recognized and dealt with objectively if, when, and as it appears imbedded in these great traditions of the human spirit. To overlook it or neglect it is to distort these traditions and to deprive the growing person in his search for the higher meaning of life of one of the priceless legacies of the human heritage. Religion is as old and universal as man and his culture. It is rooted in man's essential nature and answers to his deepest need. Once this fact is fully perceived, there is no need for argument or persuasion in support of religion. It is man's age-old search for the meaning and worth of the human adventure, as urgent today as in any period of man's quest of the good life.

II

Religion and Public Education

A PERSONALIST VIEW

CHARLES DONAHUE

Professor of English, Fordham University, Bronx, New York

I

IT IS NOW a widely recognized fact that our national ideals are religious in origin and derive directly or indirectly from the Judaeo-Christian tradition. That tradition supplies the moral dynamism of the national life and the basis for any historical or philosophical understanding of what our society stands for. It would seem to be a truism that all our national education and particularly the education supported by public funds should give all reasonable and legal support to the moral dynamism of our religious tradition and provide at appropriate levels the necessary background for historical and philosophical understanding of our ideals. Generalizations about so varied an activity as public education are dangerous. The situation differs from state to state and from community to community. But there are many who feel that, in general, the religious core of our national life is inadequately represented in the public schools. In some extreme cases, religion is excluded as though it were a tabu subject. It is not surprising if children subjected to such an atmosphere in school come to feel uncomfortable about the religious convictions they derive from their homes and to regard these convictions as something merely private and domestic, not related to the broader national life which is the concern of the school. And where religion is not mentioned, an adequate presentation of our national values and our cultural history is impossible. It is an attempt to present *Hamlet* without Hamlet.

A considerable number of public educators believe it is inevitable that religion should be a tabu subject in the public schools of a nation where there is great diversity of religious conviction and where the establishment of a religion is contrary to the consti-

tution. They point out (quite correctly) that present policies of omitting references to religion in the public schools were adopted mainly because of objections brought by religious groups against doctrines or practices with which they were not in accord. Most of these educators are convinced that public schools can nevertheless make a decisive contribution to the national moral life by teaching "moral and spritual" values without suggesting that these values have anything to do with religious commitments. It is hard to see how policies of this sort could do anything but perpetuate the anomalous situation whereby a religious nation is served by a public education where religion is not mentioned. Further, pursuit of such policies would impose upon public education the enormous task of developing for the schools a non-religious ethics which is not the ethics of the nation. Such an ideological task could only distract energy from urgent and immediate educational problems, and even if (by what I regard as an impossible assumption) the task were successfully accomplished, the resultant secularist moralism would form a wall of separation between the public schools and an American society whose morality is religiously grounded.

II

The unrealistic character of doctrinaire secularist solutions is becoming increasingly apparent, and another solution to the problem of the relation of public education to religion seems to be gaining adherents. This solution is based on the indubitable fact that, despite the wide variety of religious conviction in the American nation, the vast majority of the American people—we must include here the large number who are theists but not church-goers—derive their religion directly or indirectly from one form or an-

other of the Judaeo-Christian tradition and share some very important basic convictions of that tradition. Among these shared convictions, the most important is Judaeo-Christian theism: God exists; He created man, man's rights and duties, and a moral order by which these rights and duties are determined. State institutions have always acknowledged this national conviction, and in that fact many see the solution to the problem of moral and spiritual values in public education. Public schools cannot teach "sectarian" religious doctrine, but, like other state institutions, they can profess a "non-sectarian" theism and ground their presentation of values in this theism.

Obviously, this solution is more realistic than the secularist solution. It would help to create in the schools a moral atmosphere closer to that of the homes the schools serve. It would make it possible to interpret our institutions in the terms in which they were conceived and developed and in which they are understood by the majority of the nation. But proponents of non-sectarian theism talk at times as though they expected more than this from the plan. They feel that it would in itself give public education a dynamic moral character which would compensate for neglect of religious and moral formation in the home. It is even possible to find suggestions that "putting God back into the schools" is the answer to social problems such as juvenile delinquency.

Such hopes are, perhaps, too sanguine, and, to understand why, one need only look a little more closely at the state theism upon which they are based. It is true that American state institutions recognize the existence of God. It is necessary that they do so if the nation is to remain free, because a minimum essential of a free society is a clear distinction between the things of God and the things of Caesar. If the state is blind to the existence of God, the distinction is obliterated. Everything, as far as Caesar can see, belongs to Caesar, and the respect for the sacral level in the person of the citizen will almost certainly tend to disappear. The citizen belongs, in his whole person, to the state. Our state theism is the bow which Caesar makes to God. That bow is

necessary, but it is not in any complete sense a religion and is not intended to be. Doubtless public schools should discuss our state theism and call attention to its importance in limiting the area of state action and keeping open for the citizen the possibility of developing a religious life according to his conscience and free from state coercion. But the result of such discussion would be primarily a clearer view of the character and limitations of our civil and secular institutions rather than any specifically religious insight. Doubtless, too, prayer is appropriate in public schools as in other state institutions, but the meaning of the prayer for the individual pupil will depend, I suspect, upon the depth and character of his religious formation.

III

In our pluralist system a religious formation in depth cannot come from the state or from a state institution. We can grant that our state theism is more than a mere Deism, that the God of our state institutions is not only a necessary hypothesis, the God of the philosophers, but the God of Abraham, a God with whom the human creature can and ought to establish a personal relationship, an I-Thou relationship and of the fact that the common good, even in secular affairs, is served by persons who seek it. The state has no recommendations as to how the person who is a citizen is to work out his relationship to God.

The religious bodies, Jewish, Christian, and other, which exist in the nation provide in their doctrine and practices ways of seeking the I-Thou relationship. They provide them directly to those who are formally associated with one or another of them; indirectly to those who choose to work out their religious and moral lives independently of any church connection. The state has no substitutes to offer in place of what is provided to the national life by the communities of faith within the nation. There is no official state secularist moralism which can be a substitute. Neither is there any "non-sectarian" state religion. The religious activity of the state consists chiefly in pointing to the freely developed and pluralistic religious life of the nation and inviting the citizen to work out

his sacral life there according to his conscience and apart from anything the state has to offer.

Consequently, if one looks at the national religious life from the point of view of the state, the words "sect" and "sectarian" become quite meaningless. From the point of view of a specific religious commitment, it is of course possible to attach a concrete meaning to the word "sect." Thus, a Jew looking at the Judaeo-Christian tradition from the point of view of his religious convictions might reasonably regard all varieties of Christianity as sects. In countries where there is an established religion, the word "sect" can be meaningfully used also in a civic context to designate any community of faith other than the one established by law. Similarly, in countries such as the Soviet Union, where there is an officially established state substitute for religion, it may make sense to speak of all religious bodies as sects. They are offering a doctrine which competes with the official doctrine of the state and which, consequently, cuts off their adherents from a national community of conviction which the state is aiming to maintain. In the United States and similar pluralistic countries, however, the word "sect" has a concrete meaning only in a religious context, and that meaning will vary according to the religious convictions of the speaker. But in a civic context, as for example in a discussion of the relation of the public schools to the religious life of the nation, the word simply has no concrete meaning. Religious bodies in a pluralist society are not competing with anything the state has to offer.

It is, consequently, not enough to say that the American state "tolerates" religion. The traditional attitude of the American state towards the free and pluralistic religious life of the nation, whether organized or individualistic, is one of friendly neutrality. It is neutral because our nation has been religiously pluralistic from its beginnings and because most adherents of the various branches of the Judaeo-Christian tradition have learned from history what could perhaps have been learned sooner from reflection on their theological convictions, namely that

genuine religious commitment cannot be coerced. It is friendly because of the realization that the uncoerced religious life of the nation supplies moral direction and dynamism to persons engaged in the temporal affairs that are the immediate concern of the state and that the state, precisely because of its religious neutrality, has no resources of its own which can supply that direction. When our secular affairs, matters of the common defense, food, clothing, housing, wages and hours of labor and the rest, are conducted according to the best in our national traditions, they are conducted in accordance with the moral values of the Judaeo-Christian tradition. Such is the case not because the state is committed to the moral values of that tradition considered in abstraction from the concrete and diverse patterns of religious conviction which form the core of the religious and moral life of the persons who are citizens, but rather because the persons directing the state through their votes and acting for the state in public office are motivated in their civil actions by specific forms of the Judaeo-Christian tradition. The specific form may be derived directly through membership in a particular community of faith; or it may be some individualistic structure made of elements taken from one or several such communities. In either case, a consideration of the moral character of state action in our society leads away from abstractions to a consideration of persons and of the specific patterns of conviction that motivate persons.

The choice between a sacral life led in a community, such as a church, synagogue, or Ethical Culture group, and sacral individualism (whether the basis of that individualism be some private kind of theism or some more or less secularist moralism) is, of course, a matter for the conscience of the individual citizen. But the individual citizen must choose. Unlike the state, he is a person. He cannot imitate the sacral neutrality of the state. This point is obvious if we look first to traditional faiths with well defined bodies of law and doctrine, such as Conservative Protestantism, Conservative Judaism, and Catholicism. A citizen may look at these

communities with the neutrality of the state and conclude that all of them succeed in nourishing the religious and moral lives of a considerable number of his fellow-citizens. But he cannot come into existential contact with any of these faiths without commitment, and commitment to any one of them excludes commitment to either of the others. Let us suppose that our citizen decides to make no commitment to any of the more dogmatic religions. He has nonetheless made a religious choice and an important one. He has excluded himself from all conservative religions. He may remain an admirer from afar of some of the values of these religions. But one does not live by values one admires from afar; one lives by values to which one is committed. To some of the values he admires, our citizen will commit himself. They constitute his religion. He may decide to associate himself with a group that makes few dogmatic demands or he may decide to remain unchurched. The choice is free; the necessity of choosing is inescapable. The sincere religious liberal is a committed person equally with the sincere conservative; the unchurched equally with the church-goer. The state looks on impartially. The choice is not a matter for the state but for the individual conscience.

Our unprejudiced citizen, however, who surveys the pluralistic religious life of the nation and makes his choices in accord with his conscience, is an abstraction, a being who never existed and who never could exist. We have assumed he has a conscience which is at once mature and without previous commitments. That is obviously an impossibility. A conscience grows to maturity only in making commitments. Considered in the abstract, man is doubtless a religious and moral being just as he is a talking being. But an individual person raised apart from a particular linguistic society would never learn to talk at all. There is no such thing as talk in the abstract. The human child must be taught some particular language from infancy. He must be committed by the choice of others to a particular linguistic community. Once his power of speech has come into act by his initiation into a community, he can, if

he wishes, investigate other languages, learn them, and even discard the original one. He is linguistically free, but only through an original commitment which he could not make freely. Others had to commit him, and, if they had refused to do so, they would not have conferred greater freedom. The child would not have learned to talk at all, and far from being linguistically free he would have been an imbecile. Perhaps the case is not so very different with the religious and moral life. The child's potentialities for leading such a life come into act gradually as he is introduced into some particular religious and moral community. Any later religious and moral activity presupposes this previous formation, and a refusal on the part of those responsible to commit the child results not in freedom but in imbecility. Both in language and religion, the child, who is a potential human person, becomes a human person in act by acquiring membership in a community.

IV

Where a state institution deals with a child, therefore, as in a public school, the usual method of settling relationships between civil authority and the religious life of the nation by appeal to the conscience of the citizen is impossible. A child's conscience is at least in part only a potentiality. It is in the process of formation under guidance, and guidance necessarily takes the form of an introduction into some particular community of faith. The problem of religious, moral, and spiritual values in the public schools is the problem of how the school, as a state institution, can best adjust itself to the developing religious and moral life which comes to it in the person of the child. The best approach to a solution of the problem is perhaps to confront candidly the fact that, in a pluralist society like our own, the public school cannot set up its own community of faith. To do that would be to establish a state religion or (what modern experience has proved to be a more dangerous procedure) a state substitute for religion. This is not to say that moral and spiritual values play no part in the life of the public school. They do, of course, as they do in our secular life in general. But they come into the situation because they exist in

persons, and there they operate in so far as they are embedded, as it were, in a matrix of conviction which differs from person to person. As in other secular institutions of our pluralist society, the moral life of the school leads away from the secular and pluralist community back to particular communities of faith. The case is not very different if what we have called state theism is made a part of the life of the school. State theism is not a complete religion. Like state morality, it points away from itself to the free religious life of the nation where alone the depth and specification to make it a real force in the life of the human person can be found.

As a state institution, the public school is necessarily a secular institution. But in a pluralist society like our own to say that an institution is secular is to say that it cannot without assistance offer a formation which will bring the religious level of the human person into act. In order to be spiritually effective, public education must have allies, and those allies must be communities which can deal directly with the religious level in the child's development. The success of the public school in handling moral and spiritual values is likely to depend on its success in establishing effective co-operation with its necessary allies. I am, of course, not suggesting that there be any kind of official liaison on an institutional level between churches, synagogues or other religious groups and the public schools. That is not necessary and might in some cases be awkward. There are many American children who are unchurched because their families are unchurched, and where the family choice is really a choice, a matter of principle and not of indifference, it must be respected by a state institution. In the case of such religious individualists, the educative community of faith and the family are identical. Whether or not a larger religious group enters the situation, the family is the first and indispensable formative community. There if anywhere, the child acquires the habits and convictions which bring the religious level of his personality into act and make future development possible. A respect for the sacral level

of the child's development, a development which the public school can neither initiate nor influence directly, leads back to the family as the indispensable ally of the school. The sacral conviction of the family and the doctrine and practice of any religious body with which the family is connected enter the public school in the person of the child. The problem of religious, spiritual, and, in the main, moral values in the schools is, more concretely stated, the problem of how the school proposes to deal with this level of the child's personality.

V

Perhaps the way to a more effective spiritual and moral program in public schools leads through a closer examination of the possibilities opened by a confrontation of the pluralistic religious life of the community, present in the classroom in the persons of the children, with the friendly neutrality of the American state towards this activity. Neutrality excludes any initiative on the part of the school. The state merely points to the religious life of the nation and invites a choice. The first step, it seems to me, towards an effective spiritual and moral program is a clear realization that the religious neutrality necessary and proper for the state and state institutions in a pluralist society is impossible for human persons. Public school policy towards moral and spiritual values, then, might well begin with an effort in parent education designed to make it clear to families whose children attend the school that the school cannot provide all that is necessary for the moral and spiritual development of those children. It could be pointed out that the school's success in dealing with moral and spiritual values presupposes family initiative in providing a spiritual background of some sort and that, if the family fails to act, the family (not the school) is responsible for the moral and spiritual imbecility that may result. A campaign by the public schools to inform parents of what the schools cannot be expected to do and to stimulate family responsibility and initiative in sacral matters would, in itself be a solid contribution to the moral and spiritual life of the nation. On

the other hand, hints that the public schools can supply the want of family initiative in sacral formation through some "non-sectarian" religion or "non-sectarian" substitute for religion blur the issue and may encourage irresponsibility.

Granted the necessary family initiative, the next question is how the school can best co-operate with the sacral formation going on outside the school. A stony silence about religion is hardly co-operative, and it does not reflect the neutrality of the state towards religious matters, for the state's neutrality is a friendly neutrality. A policy of silence may in some communities be necessary as a temporary expedient. It is obviously not satisfactory as a permanent solution. From a personalist point of view, a permanent solution would require consideration by teachers' colleges of how best to equip their graduates to personify in the classroom the friendly neutrality of the state to all the faiths present in the classroom in the persons of the children. Such graduates would have an emphatic knowledge of religious positions other than their own and could find means of conveying to each child that he was accepted not in spite of the faith he brought from home but, in part, because of it and that that faith was a part of the religious life of the nation and not merely a private and domestic matter. Properly equipped teachers could perhaps devise means to produce a classroom atmosphere where the children would accept one another in full consciousness of religious differences and with respect for the

religious formation of their peers as valuable contributions to the pluralist and secular classroom community. Such an atmosphere could not come about without some tactful references to religion and religious differences. With such a basis laid early, it might be possible later on to talk about religion and its place in our society in classes in social studies and literature. Such a practice would help to develop religious literacy along with other kinds of literacy.

VI

There are many other possibilities, but my aim is not to offer a solution or a program, but rather to indicate the complexity of the problem and to make a suggestion as to the road along which a solution may be sought. A prerequisite, surely, of any solution is that it be in accord with the general ideals and practices of our free and pluralist society. That society has been so successful in stimulating cooperation between persons of various religious convictions that there is sound reason to hope that a pluralist fellowship of concern will be formed which may contribute to a solution. A pluralist society such as ours is a relatively new thing in human history and so is the kind of democratic public education to which we are committed. Obviously, much experiment, much patience, and good will will be necessary before these two great forces can be satisfactorily adjusted to one another. Perhaps the greatest present danger is the temptation to arrive at a quick solution in terms of an over-simplified view of how our society works.

III

A WORKSHOP ON

Religion in the Public Schools

ARTHUR GILBERT

National Director, Department of Interreligious Cooperation, Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, 212 Fifth Avenue, New York 10, N. Y.

ONE HUNDRED FIFTY leaders of American education from 24 states, Washington, D. C. and Puerto Rico gathered together in New York City, April 29-30, to attend a National Conference on Human Relations called by the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith. Among these leaders there were superintendents from large cities, educational consultants from various federal departments, professors of education, supervisors of curriculum and outstanding classroom teachers. Together, on this "historic occasion," they planned ways of extending human relations education throughout the United States.

This was a working conference. Speeches and addresses were kept to a minimum. The delegates were given two days to grapple with five major discussion areas: The training of teachers in human relations education, the use of materials and techniques, the implementation of desegregation, the effective use of education as a means of changing attitude.

A fifth work group dealt with the problem of religion in the public school and the implications of that problem for human relations education. The chairman was Dr. Rolfe Lanier Hunt, Director of the Department of Religion and Public Education of the National Council of Churches. Major presentations were made by Dr. Eugene Dawson, Chairman of the Religious Education Project of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education; Dr. H. H. Remmers, Purdue University; and Dr. Theodore Brameld, New York University.

The twenty-five delegates who attended this fifth section brought with them a variety of backgrounds and sharply divergent approaches. Among the group were clergymen representing Protestant, Catholic and Jewish

viewpoints; educators with administrative responsibility for executing programs of moral and spiritual values, and other educators and community leaders who questioned the appropriateness of the public school to teach religion.

As the various current issues—spiritual and moral values, the factual teaching of religion, the rights of the majority to have its views adopted in the public school—were brought to the attention of the group, there were heated exchanges. Flashes of spontaneous repartee were interspersed with the prepared presentations. The argument flowed quickly from one theme to another and back again, for the unstructured agenda welcomed free discussion, frank and honest questioning. The fact that this group, with such broadly representative views, could have come to a point of agreement is a tribute to the democratic process. Yet, the workshop did reach a statement of consensus. The understanding of how this came about and what had to be articulated before agreement could be reached is crucial to this report. So let us begin with the first session.

I

At that first session, each of the participants was asked for one statement on the function of the school in dealing with religion to serve as a basis of discussion. The following statements clearly demonstrate the wide range of thought and opinion:

1. We are challenged as educators to give careful thought and attention to our responsibilities for character education. The issue is confused because we are not clear as to what we mean by moral and spiritual values. Certainly there must not be indoctrination of sectarian creeds in the public school.

2. The effective teaching of moral and spiritual values will be virtually impossible unless we locate these values within the framework of their theological source. Our children must recognize that God is the author of all values; that our ethical ideals are rooted in religious tradition.

3. We must teach moral and spiritual values without the use of sectarian sanctions. Ethics can be communicated effectively without identifying them within religious tradition. That particular responsibility belongs to the home and the church.

4. Religion is and should be studied in the same way as economic institutions are studied. It is something which is so much a part of the American heritage that it cannot be ignored. How to do this is the burdensome question.

5. Although there have been concerted efforts to have the public school teach about religion, the practical problems are so formidable that it is inadvisable now to increase the amount of such teaching.

6. Since religious beliefs are of such spiritual significance and carry such emotional conviction, we must insist it is the responsibility alone of the home and the church to teach religion, or to communicate information about religion. The public school may maintain only a healthy respect for the right of every individual to his own religious belief.

7. A minority viewpoint ought not determine in a local community the policy with regard to religious education in the public schools. Some way must be found to have the school respond to the needs of the majority without unduly offending the minority.

8. Because religion is so very personal, it is wrong for the question of religious instruction in the public school to be determined by the majority of a school board, faculty, community or nation.

9. Religion is so basic in our culture that, in order to prevent the growth of denominational parochial schools, a practical solution to religion in the schools must be found.

10. The limitations which have been imposed on the public schools with reference to religion and the teaching of religious

values have been imposed by religionists rather than educators; although today the educators are often unjustly accused by some of sponsoring secularism and atheism.

II

At the second session, Dr. Eugene Dawson reviewed the efforts to define the function of the public school in dealing with religion. Devoting his major attention to "the teaching-about" approach, Dr. Dawson enumerated the large support that this proposal had received from national educational bodies and religious leaders. He suggested that among the values said to accrue from such a program were the following: "... Such a method is in accord with the philosophy and practices of general education . . . if we are genuinely serious about educating the 'whole' student and about sensitizing him to his cultural heritage in the fullest extent of that term, we must be concerned in our teaching with the impact which religion has made in our culture."

"A second objective . . . pertains to the matter of religious literacy . . . Advocates of the factual study of religion do not insist that such an approach is the only approach to the problem of religious literacy, but they do feel that such a program is apt to reach more people and is far less vulnerable to some of the serious criticisms revolving about legal limitations and sectarian disputes than are certain other procedures."

Dr. Dawson warned the group, however, that even with such a plan, "... in a pluralistic culture such as ours, the omnipresent dangers are, that there will be violations of the principles of separation of church and state, or . . . that individuals or groups within the framework of the public school will embark on sectarian crusades for the purpose of winning devotees." "Such apprehension," he asserted, "is not to be relegated to the level of delusional behavior. To our detriment and humiliation, this is happening every day, and it could get worse before it gets better. As many people view with alarm this situation, it is not enough to excuse such efforts to indoctrinate by insisting that 'you can get by with it because the community represents a homogeneous climate.' In a certain

sense, such a climate may even demand a greater concern and sensitivity on the part of the community."

"There are no simple solutions or easy answers . . . Mistakes will be made . . . Still is it unrealistic to expect some improvement in the situation, if careful attention is given to teacher preparation? . . . Admittedly, such teaching, to be effective, will require capable and emotionally secure teachers, teachers earnestly interested in leading students not only to a better understanding of the beliefs and practices of others, but why they feel and believe as they do."

Dr. Dawson then described the five-year program of Religion in Teacher Education under the auspices of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

Finally, Dr. Dawson discussed the various criticisms made by many that "should it be entirely possible to teach about religion, to maintain an objective position, and to refrain from encouraging personal commitment on the part of the students, there is little that remains in the process that contributes to the moral and spiritual development." To this critique he put this question: "Is a learning experience itself ineffectual when it stimulates students to be intelligent about religion and the reasons why people are motivated to prize it?" Dr. Dawson concluded: "Those who speak in behalf of the factual study of religion, then, would not do so on the basis that it leads to 'evangelical results' or to specific commitments as they have been traditionally conceived . . . We would do well to recall Julius Seelye Bixler's statement that 'knowledge cannot be a barrier to the life of the spirit because the demand for more knowledge is itself a spiritual demand.'"

The two-hour discussion that followed this paper brought into play again the variety of opinions held by the participants. Every one agreed: factual teaching would not limit itself to the presentation of cut and dried information; the proper teaching of even objective facts involves feelings; and when knowledge is properly communicated, attitudes can be changed. There was a difference of opinion, however, on the conse-

quences of such teaching. One speaker insisted that the acquisition of such facts may lead to a critical or questioning attitude toward religion. Another suggested that in the hands of some teachers such a factual study of religion may be a divisive influence. A third participant warned that were the schools unable to develop a program for dealing with religion, religiously-affiliated parents would feel compelled to establish their own schools. But, retorted another in reply, 150 years ago not more than one in fifteen were members of a church. Today, more than 50% of the American people are members of religious institutions. Clearly, this indicates that the public school in no way interferes with the development of the religious concerns on the part of the American people. On the other hand, asserted another participant, the development of an intensive understanding of religion enables children to rise above the prejudices of their community and promotes fellowship. In that speaker's experience this was the consequence of faith at work in some parts of the South, where white children were able to accept Negro classmates only as a result of their religious commitments.

Professor Kilpatrick, who concluded this session, reiterated his belief that "we want our schools to put into everything they do a religious spirit, the spirit of harmony and brotherhood among men, the spirit of respect for the dignity of the individual. This spirit can be communicated, however, without having at all to use the word 'religion.'"

III

Dr. H. H. Remmers opened the third session with an analysis of the Purdue University Opinion Panel Study on the Attitudes of Teen-agers to Religious Problems. Among the items disclosed by the poll was the fact that teenagers believe, to a higher degree than adults, that the public schools should teach religion (47% of teen-agers in contrast to 33% of adults, according to Roper). These 47% consisted of 52% of the polled Catholic students, 47% of the polled Protestant teen-agers, and 23% of the polled Jewish teen-agers.

Other questions of interest were:

Question	% Agreeing	
	Boys	Girls
Religious faith is better than logic for solving life's important problems	53	61
School time devoted to learning ethical and spiritual values, what is right and wrong should be:		
More	50	55
Same	43	40
Less	7	5
I would like to know more about religion	87	91
I am confused in my religious beliefs	21	21
People lose faith in their religion by studying certain sciences	34	29
My parents sometimes discuss differences in religious beliefs between themselves and with me	39	48
Do you think the public school should teach a course covering the history and teachings of all the world's major religions?	43	46

In the discussion that followed, Dr. Remmers also referred to the study by M. Scott Myers entitled "The Latent Role of Religious Orientation," in which Dr. Myers demonstrates that high school students tended to avoid taking courses in school that presented points of view in conflict with their own religious beliefs.

Dr. Theodore Brameld then summarized the views on religious education of nine liberal arts philosophers. These men were asked by the National Society for the Study of Education to articulate the implications for education of their respective philosophic positions. Their essays are to be found in the published yearbook of the Society, *Modern Philosophies in Education*. The philosophers all agreed that the problem of religious education cannot be resolved by choosing between the two usual alternatives of indoctrinating a particular creed on the one hand, and on the other hand ignoring religion entirely. As Dr. Brameld points out, "They insist that religion is a fundamental experience of human life and therefore, it ought to have a significant place in all kinds of education. This, of course, is also the view of those who now are advocating a teaching-about approach . . . But such philosophers . . . certainly feel that the "teaching-about" approach as a solution to the di-

lemma . . . is inadequate . . . They feel this because religion is an affair of conviction . . . or passion. The teacher who attempts to exclude his own convictions, his own passion, from the study of religion is creating a highly artificial kind of situation—indeed a situation that may produce considerable hypocrisy. They believe that we must move towards a program of teaching religion which somehow, managing to avoid indoctrination, at the same time introduces a factor of conviction and commitment."

Elaborating on his own beliefs, Dr. Brameld suggested that it was artificial for teachers and students to have to separate their feelings and convictions from the facts. Dr. Brameld suggested, rather, that in a few selected experimental situations, teachers with varying religious views, including teachers who hold no theistic position at all, be trained to lead 16-year-olds in the study of religion. Such a study would involve the use of community resources, in that students would spend a great deal of time studying religious practices in the community itself. "The aim of such a pilot project would be not only the study of religious institutions factually, but it would permit the teachers themselves and the resource people to review their convictions and to indicate their reasons for those convictions. It would, very obviously, require extremely careful planning to avoid weighting one religious position as against the other. The aim would be as thorough and comprehensive and comparative an examination as possible. . . ."

As a final objective, Dr. Brameld would have the students "attempt to achieve whatever consensus they feel capable of achieving with regard to the religious attitudes and beliefs that they think most justifiably emerge as a result of their study. This consensus clearly would unlikely be unanimous. There may be no consensus at all . . . Frequently, students would simply reconfirm the belief they already have. In some cases, however, and this is the chance that free public education must always take, the students may modify the view they already hold, possibly even reject them . . . If so, this would simply exemplify the kind of process that

goes on in any kind of democratic situation."

Dr. Brameld argued for this experimental approach on the grounds that it was more in accord with the "functional organismic approach" in that it avoided "dualizing between teaching about facts, and our feelings and interests as they are involved in those facts."

Finally, he said "The consensus principle inherent in this approach is consistent with the way people behave when they go through the process of examining questions and then reaching decisions . . . In real life, people do not just study problems. They do not just consider alternatives. They reach conclusions and they act on these . . . Why should not young people, too, study problems of all kinds, political, moral and religious, but attempt to go beyond those problems to decisions and commitments about them? Such decisions are not final, absolute, fixed. . . .

"It would be foolhardy to suggest this as a model for religious education in the country as a whole, but I like to believe that good education is not education which always compromises with the immediate status-quo kind of pressure situation of the typical school, but that it is education with vision. It is education governed by audacious proposals. It is willing to try these proposals to see whether they are workable or not, with the objective of then feeding back the successful results into the school program of the country as a whole."

Dr. Brameld's suggestions provoked heated discussion. The objection was raised that it was inconceivable that a teacher to plead his own religious faith in a public school classroom, or bring in proponents of a particular faith, without incurring the violent disapproval of parents. It was also declared that this kind of teaching would not work on the elementary or secondary school level, although it might work at the university level. Still others insisted, however, that the democratic process requires such a presentation of passionate viewpoints; children then would be able to make a choice on the basis of fact and conviction.

IV

Discussion was continued through the

next sessions on the present place and practice of religion in the public school. One speaker asserted, "You cannot tell the public school to be neutral in matters of faith and yet insist that such schools are not godless. When religionists say that the schools are godless, they mean that they are neutral on the issue of God."

"Can we not help religious leaders see that this attitude will lead to the destruction of the public school which has, in effect, enabled the religionist to maintain his religious freedom in America?" another questioned.

"But there are groups which believe that faith is extremely crucial . . . I am convinced that the largest group of people in America want the public schools to do something to meet their religious concerns and needs."

"I believe that the schools should be secular," argued another educator. "I think the word 'godless' represents the proper neutrality maintained by the school. It is not a bad word. We can teach in the schools that many people do believe in religion, but we must not and cannot encourage commitment to religion. We cannot make children feel guilty if they do not believe in a super-natural God, which is what happens when we introduce prayer, Bible reading and other religious rites into the public school program."

"Neutrality is a disguise behind which the humanist hides as he propagandizes his own particular religious values to school children . . . We church people are very concerned about what is being taught in the public school. We are going to take weekday religious education seriously, and it will be pushed widely . . . If the needs of the vast majority of church people are not met by the public schools, then they will do something to organize a parochial school system. . . ."

V

Clearly, there were serious differences of opinion among the participants. There was a quickening of thought as the group spontaneously, of its own decision, decided to work toward some sort of statement of agreement. Was there not any one thing on which such a group could agree? Could the group not decide on next steps? What procedure did

they feel ought to be followed in dealing constructively with this question of religion in the public school?

At the concluding session, the following statements were composed, discussed and accepted as the consensus of the group:

Statement I

Having met to discuss the role of education in human relations, it is the conviction of this group that the public school system of America has a unique opportunity for the development of good human relations by bringing children of various racial, cultural and religious groups together.

Statement II

Because we believe that it is important to test the hypothesis that the study of religion in the public schools will improve human relations, we believe that the place of religion in the public schools needs careful study by educators and laymen, and that intensive study and experimentation with specific programs for the study of religion in the public schools should be undertaken in a few carefully selected situations.

As the statements were discussed, various participants proposed qualifications and clarifying additions. Some of these suggestions provoked, once again, sharp disagreement, however most of them were accepted as integral additions:

1. Policies and programs dealing with the teaching of religion in the public school ought to be developed by constituted school authorities, in consultation with concerned community leaders and scholars in religion.

Educators and community leaders must ascertain whether the public school should at all engage in the teaching of religion. They must agree on the objectives of such a study of religion. In order to come to a decision, the community should be provided with information concerning present practices in the public school; the community should receive an evaluation of those practices. Wherever possible, it will be helpful to have an evaluation of the experiences of parochial schools with reference to the agreed upon objectives for religious edu-

cation in the school; for parochial schools are designed to teach religion, in contrast to the public school, where the teaching of religious doctrines is allegedly forbidden.

2. The content and aims of such experimental programs should be related to and consistent with general educational aims.
3. Such experimental programs must be consistent with constitutional requirements.
4. Experiments must not be undertaken at random. The call for experimentation must not lead to a movement of experimentation (it was feared that in the guise of experimentation, religious instruction would be introduced widely into public school education). National or state educational bodies might assume control of such experimentation in the limited number of communities that would be chosen to undertake such studies.
5. Wherever such experiments are inaugurated, there must be careful inservice training of teachers for the experimental project.
6. Any experiments undertaken in the teaching of religion must not involve sectarian indoctrination and must involve a fair consideration of all differing religious views (There was some debate as to whether there must be a fair consideration of theistic and non-theistic religious views. The group agreed that this was implicit in the qualifying statement, but they refused to make it explicit).
7. Such experiments must be studied in order to evaluate their effect on children and their attitudes toward their own religion, the development of their moral character, and the development of their appreciation for the faiths of others.
8. Two participants then suggested that the place of religion in the public school needs study in order to ascertain whether it will not result in an increased religious literacy and a quickened response to the religious challenge. These goals are basic to the effort to introduce religion into the public school. The success of a program of religious study should be determined not alone by its effect on the improvement of human relations (this qualification was not accepted by the group).

The agreement on Statements I and II above demonstrate that despite vast differences of opinion, educators, religious leaders and representatives of community agencies could reach agreement on a plan of procedure for dealing with the crucial problem of reli-

gion in the public school. If this kind of collective consensus could be achieved in our various communities, there is hope that we might yet arrive at a definition of the function of the public school in dealing with religion.

ON NOVEMBER 9, 1938, in the city of Heidelberg, Germany, gathering flames licked a pile of Jewish books. Nazi hordes witnessed the destruction of the Talmud, the encyclopedia of Jewish tradition and life, originally produced in the Palestinian and Babylonian academies during the Aramaic period, and eventually concluded in the fifth century of the Christian era. These books and others, and Jewish papers and documents were tossed from the old city's only syna-

Ten years after the bonfire in Heidelberg, Professor William Haber told the writer that craftsmen in the city would be engaged in the printing of a special edition of the Talmud and that the United States Army of Occupation in Germany would be vitally interested in the success of the project, which was to take four years to complete.

In May, 1949, the first volume was completed and was presented by Harry Greenstein, Advisor of Jewish Affairs in Germany, to General Lucius Clay, Commander-in-Chief, as a gesture of thanks to the American Army, in bringing the Talmud back into Germany.

The 19-volume set of the Heidelberg Tal-

mud weighs approximately 160 pounds. It cost about \$1000 to print a full set. More than four tons of paper were required for the printing of 950 volumes. In each volume there is a dedication in English, signed by Rabbi Samuel Sneig, Chairman and Chief Rabbi of the U. S. Zone, reading: "Dedication of Talmud in 19 volumes to the United States Army, printed manual offset by Drukkerrei Carl, Heidelberg, Germany, under the supervision of the Procurement Division, European Quartermaster, U. S. Army."

The writer first saw the set of the Talmud in the library of the B'nai B'rith Hillel Foundation at the University of Michigan at Ann Arbor in 1952. This was made possible because of the interest of Prof. Haber in Hillel and in the project as a whole, since he was the Jewish Advisor to the U. S. Army Commander in Germany (who replaced Judge Louis E. Levinthal) and who was, and is, Professor of Economics at the University of Michigan and had considerable administrative experience in public affairs. — *Philip Serman*, University of Judaism, Los Angeles, California.

IV

RELIGION IN PUBLIC EDUCATION¹

THE AMERICAN JEWISH COMMITTEE
386 Fourth Avenue, New York 16, N. Y.

WITH INCREASING frequency, the American Jewish Committee is asked to express its position on many of the complex issues related to religion in the public schools. This statement of views—some held by the Committee for many years—comes in answer to these requests.

The beneficent teachings of religion have contributed immeasurably to man's progress from barbarism to civilization. This country particularly, which was settled in large measure by those seeking freedom of conscience, has been profoundly influenced by religious concepts. With church affiliation in the United States now at an all-time peak, religion is certainly a vital factor in our lives.

In the opinion of many, the vitality of American churches and synagogues flows from our unique tradition of separating church and state. This cardinal principle has insured freedom of conscience for all. It has permitted scores of religious sects to flourish without hinderance. It has enabled us to escape much of the sectarian strife which has marked the history of other lands.

Today, the long-established interpretation of the separation principle, especially as it applies to the role of the public schools with regard to religion, is being debated. There is danger that this nationwide controversy may lead to a radical departure from our time-tested concept of public education as a secular institution.

There are, of course, many church-state issues unrelated to the schools—issues touching on social welfare, health, recreation and communication. But since public education is the center of current concern, it is here that attention is focused.

Nature of the Controversy

The world crisis has caused many Ameri-

cans to question whether our moral fibre is strong enough to surmount the stresses and strains of troubled times.

Such soul-searching has provoked much discussion about the role of religion in the education of our children. Because of increasing juvenile delinquency and other problems, some anxious parents are wondering whether there ought not to be greater religious emphasis in the schools.

Some churchmen claim that public education has failed to perform its full function and that our children are therefore morally deficient. These critics contend that since the child's "working day" is spent in the classroom, it is incumbent upon the public school to provide religious instruction.

Other clergymen maintain that, in keeping with our constitutional principle of separation, the task of inculcating a religious outlook is the responsibility of the home, the church and the synagogue. It is not a legitimate function of the public school.

Basic Premises

The American Jewish Committee's position with respect to this problem is based on two primary convictions:

(a)

Separation of church and state, as defined by the United States Supreme Court in interpreting the guarantees of the First Amendment, offers a sound foundation for maintaining religious freedom.

In the words of the Court:

Neither a state nor the Federal Government can set up a church. Neither can pass laws which aid one religion, aid all religions, or prefer one religion over another. Neither can force nor influence a person to go to or to remain away from church against his will or force him to profess a belief or disbelief in any religion. No person can be punished for entertaining or professing religious beliefs or disbeliefs, for church attendance or non-

¹Reprinted from a pamphlet by the same title by special permission. Copies of this pamphlet may be secured from the American Jewish Committee.

attendance. No tax in any amount, large or small, can be levied to support any religious activities or institutions, whatever they may be called, or whatever form they may adopt to teach or practice religion. Neither a state nor the Federal Government can, openly or secretly, participate in the affairs of any religious organizations or groups and vice versa. In the words of Jefferson, the clause against establishment of religion by law was intended to erect "a wall of separation between Church and State."²

Applying the Court's pronouncement to education, two conclusions emerge:

— The maintenance and furtherance of religion are responsibilities of the church, the synagogue and the home, and not of the public school.

— The time, facilities, funds and personnel of our schools must not be used for religious purposes.

(b)

The public school is one of the chief instruments for developing an informed citizenry and achieving the goals of American democracy.

The current effort to revamp the school curriculum by introducing a religious emphasis may well create divisive intergroup tension, thus undermining the effectiveness of our schools as builders of democracy. Therefore, to maintain the stability of the public school system, a satisfactory solution to the problem of religion in education is urgently required.

Guiding Principles for the Schools

The public schools should continue to be governed by certain general principles dictated by experience and tradition:

— The schools should maintain complete impartiality in the realm of religion.

— Teachers should not undertake religious instruction in the schools.

— Children of every shade of religious opinion should enjoy complete equality in the classroom. Thus, whether the child be Protestant in a predominantly Catholic com-

munity, Catholic in a predominantly Protestant community, or Jewish in a predominantly Christian community, he should be on an equal footing with all his schoolmates. Moreover, youngsters with no formal religious training, as well as those who do not accept religious viewpoints, must stand as equals of their religiously-educated, observing schoolmates.

— Pertinent references to religion, whenever intrinsic to the lesson at hand, should be included in the teaching of history, the social studies, literature, art and other subjects.

— If discussion of religious doctrine arises in the classroom, the teacher should refer the children to home, church or synagogue for interpretations.

THE MAJOR ISSUES

Religion in the School Curriculum

Teaching About Religion: One of the most perplexing problems stems from the suggestion that the public schools teach *about* religion—in other words, that children study it in a factual way.

The merits of this proposal are difficult to appraise, especially on the elementary and high school levels, because there is no generally accepted definition of "teaching about religion." To some, it merely implies discussing the influence of religion and religious institutions on our civilization; to others, it means examining and comparing varying theological doctrines; still others feel it should also include teaching a common core of principles undergirding the major faiths.

The schools are, of course, obligated to provide our youngsters with insights into the ethnic and religious sources of American life, the better to prepare them for effective citizenship in our pluralistic society. Such instruction, however, should not be regarded as "teaching about religion." Rather, it should continue to be viewed as an integral function of intergroup education. In the same context, the public schools can and should instill in children an understanding of the origin and meaning of religious freedom, an awareness that our nation abounds in religious sects and an understanding that it is the genius of American democracy to welcome and respect religious diversity.

²Everson v. Board of Education of Ewing, 330 US 1, p. 15 (1947), reaffirmed in McCollum v. Board of Education, 333 US 203 (1948) and Zorach v. Clauson, 343 US 306 (1952).

The schools should also foster an appreciation of the impact of religion on our civilization. Indeed, this knowledge is intrinsic to a well-rounded education. Such events as the Crusades, the Reformation and the colonization of America would be hopelessly distorted if religious motivations were not given proper weight. It would be equally wrong to omit the Bible from courses in literature or to ignore religious influences in the study of art.

If, as some charge, teachers shy away from religious references even when they are basic to an understanding of subject matter, prompt investigation of current school practices is called for. A study of this kind would disclose whether our children are, in fact, being deprived of essential learning. Hopefully, it also would result in better handling of religious references in today's public school curriculum.

One immediate need may be to improve the quality of teacher training. Many delicate and complicated matters are included in the public school curriculum. Often, they touch on serious emotional involvements stemming from religious differences. Teachers could be helped to avoid offending the sensibilities of children in their classrooms if all teacher-training institutions included in their courses of study the necessary sociological and historical background concerning the different ethnic and religious groups in our land.

Coincident with improved teacher training, there might well be experimentation in better methods of interpreting the influence of religion on our civilization. However, experiments should be introduced only in a few selected laboratory or campus schools where the projects would be closely supervised by college or university faculties. Doctrinal encroachments should be carefully avoided. Test situations should be limited to an agreed-upon period of time and the results should be carefully evaluated with full consideration of pupil and community reaction.

Any instruction in the public schools attempting to deal with religious doctrines on a comparative basis would be undesirable.

Teachers and school administrators would encounter great difficulty in determining where "facts" end and dogmatic belief begins. Indeed, the definition of religion itself would present a serious stumbling block, and the role of the teacher would become quite untenable. For instance, how would he interpret the Bodily Assumption of Mary? The Dietary Laws? The Trinity? The Nativity? Is he expected to conceal his personal convictions? One might well doubt that every teacher could do so. Should the teacher explore all points of view, thus making the classroom an open forum for religious discussion? And if so, would this not pose in the child's mind a challenge to his traditional family faith?

It is likewise inadvisable, if not impossible, for the public schools, to teach a common core of religious belief. Such instruction, in all likelihood, would be unacceptable to some religious groups. Moreover, teachers and school administrators would be subjected to severe pressures arising from the need to accommodate the conflicting view points found in almost every American community.

In short, teaching about religion in the doctrinal sense is the function of the home, the church and the synagogue.

Teaching Basic Theological Principles: Some people urge that the schools affirm the existence of a personal God, in the belief that children would thus learn the source of our inalienable rights. Most people recognize that children should learn about God. But if this were done in a public school setting, the discussions concerning His Nature and His revelation would inevitably lead to creedal divisiveness. Instruction in this subject matter, as in other areas of the curriculum, would necessarily be governed by a set of guiding principles, thus requiring the schools to adopt a body of religious principles. While a majority of the religious leadership might well agree on certain basic tenets, the difficulty of interpretation in the classroom would still remain, as would the problem of the unaffiliated minority.

The Clergy as Instructors: Some would invite clergymen into the classroom to give sectarian

instruction to children of their respective faith. This suggestion is opposed on two counts: First, the practice is of dubious constitutionality; and second, children would tend, consciously or unconsciously, to conform to one of the dominant faiths represented in the school.

Stressing the Religious Faith of our Ancestors: It has been suggested that the schools stress the moral and spiritual heritage handed down by the Founding Fathers, in order to bring home the fact that Americans are a religious people. Advocates of this proposal urge, as one way of carrying it out, a study of historical documents, such as the Declaration of Independence. For example, the New York Board of Regents, in a statement in 1951, expressed the belief that school studies would thereby be brought into "focus and accord," and would teach "respect for lawful authority."

There can be no question of the wisdom of pointing to the religious influences which motivated the Founding Fathers. Nor is there any doubt that children should understand the religious values implicit in our great charters of liberty. However, any tendency to provide other than an historical perspective in the study of these documents should be discouraged.

Providing a Non-Sectarian Religious Emphasis: It is virtually impossible for public schools to provide "non-sectarian" religious education. Agreement is hard to achieve even on the meaning of this term. Sometimes it refers to religious instruction acceptable to a majority of the Protestant denominations, but not necessarily acceptable to others.

The term is also used to denote the highest common denominator of the three major faiths. Assuming such a formula could be arrived at, it is all but certain that its practical application would be sectarian. The teacher's unconscious bias, arising from personal convictions or lack of them, would inevitably color his interpretation.

Moral and Spiritual Values: The public schools should continue to impart the moral and spiritual values basic to all religions. A

good teacher infuses every aspect of the classroom experience with spiritual content, sensitizing children naturally to the meaning of the Golden Rule, the sanctity of the individual and the codes of fair play whereby civilized man lives. These values are communicated not only by word, but also through the teacher's character and conduct, and the quality of his relationships with pupils.

Thus, the school builds character, develops responsible citizenship and teaches young people to judge their fellows according to individual worth.

The Educational Policies Commission of the National Education Association and the American Association of School Administrators, in its report on *Moral and Spiritual Values in the Public Schools*, suggests how these important concepts can be taught without a religious sanction. This approach is heartily endorsed.

Released Time

Many communities have adopted the practice of released time, whereby children are excused from school with the consent of their parents in order to receive religious instruction. This program is opposed for the following reasons:

— It threatens the independent character of the public school. Since part of the compulsory school day is "released" by the state on condition that the participating student devote this time to sectarian instruction, the state accomplishes by indirection what it admittedly cannot undertake to do directly — it provides a governmental constraint in support of religion.

— It is a mechanism for divisiveness which is repeated at weekly intervals throughout the school year. Even when most carefully administered, the program's inherent abuses become evident: subtle sectarian pressures are exerted by overzealous teachers; non-participating children are frequently embarrassed.

— The normal school program is disrupted. Because classroom activities generally remain static during the released time period, children who do not participate suffer an unnecessary loss of school instruction.

—As the available data indicates, many children simply do not reach their religious centers. Where such unexcused absences occur, the program contributes to truancy.

Particularly deplorable is the fact that some communities continue to disregard the Supreme Court's ruling in the *McCollum* case by permitting released time classes to be held on school property.

The Bible and Prayer in the Schools

Bible Reading: Most people look upon the Bible as the source of religious inspiration. Children are taught to revere it as sacred. Therefore, the reading of any version in the public schools, except when explicitly undertaken as part of a literature course, must be regarded as a religious act, inappropriate for classroom or assembly.

In some communities, Bible reading in the schools is traditional and enjoys general public acceptance. Efforts to end this practice in these localities might precipitate unfortunate inter-religious conflict involving not only parents, but their children as well. However, in those schools where the Bible is read, only passages having universal acceptance should be selected.

Distribution of Gideon Bibles: Neither the Gideon Bible nor any other sectarian tract should be distributed on school property. Since religious groups are thereby aided in propagating their faiths, this practice must be regarded as unconstitutional.

Prayer: Organized prayer, whether spoken or silent, constitutes an act of worship and has no place in public school classroom or assembly. Therefore, recitation of the Lord's Prayer—on the mistaken assumption that it is universal rather than sectarian—is improper.

Use of School Premises for Religious Purposes

After School Use: Where school buildings are habitually made available to civic groups after school hours, thus converting the premises to general community centers, religious groups should be accorded the same privileges enjoyed by other organizations. However, the buildings should not be used during school hours for religious education, meetings or worship.

Religious Census: It would be constitutionally invalid to extend public school facilities to sectarian groups for the purpose of conducting a religious-affiliation census.

Religious Holiday Observances

Although sectarianism has no place in American public schools, the problem of religious holiday observances cannot be resolved by a doctrinaire application of the separation principle. Many factors must be taken into account:

—Even before public schools were established in America, Christmas and Easter were celebrated in classrooms. These observances are therefore imbedded in tradition.

—There is a wide variation of interpretation, among both Christians and Jews, as to which aspects of the holiday observances are sectarian and which are not.

—The nature of each celebration varies from community to community, from school to school and even from classroom to classroom.

—For many people, these holidays have assumed the aura of national, as well as sectarian, events.

—Many Christians would resent the removal of sectarian content from the holiday program as an affront to religious conviction.

—Experience shows that a fair and objective public discussion of this problem is difficult to attain and that the attempt invariably induces community friction.

Under these circumstances, making a public issue of religious holiday observances in the schools can lead to no beneficial results in the foreseeable future. However, through informal discussions with teachers, it may be possible to plan these events in such a way that no child's religious sensibilities will be offended by undue sectarian or doctrinal emphasis.

The problem of joint observance, such as Christmas-Hanukkah celebrations, offers additional complicating factors. Some see no difference in principle between celebrating a single religious event and holding a joint observance. They feel that if one part of the program is sectarian, the wrong is simply compounded by adding still another religious emphasis. Others, however, believe

that the joint observance fosters intercultural understanding by showing children how their neighbors celebrate religious holidays.

While joint religious holiday programs are not recommended, it should nevertheless be recognized that they enjoy a measure of support in some communities. It would serve a useful purpose if schools in those localities would evaluate the programs for their effect on children.

Federal Aid to Education

In order to equalize educational opportunities throughout the nation, Federal aid should be extended to the states for tax-supported, publicly-controlled elementary and secondary schools. Extension of such aid to non-public schools, either directly or indirectly, is opposed. However, free lunches and medical and dental services should be available to all children at public expense, provided there is public supervision and control of the program.

Other "fringe benefits," such as textbooks and bus transportation for children attending non-public schools, should be considered on their own merits in separate legislation,

lest they continue to retard the extension of Federal aid.

Religion has flourished in this country, although religious indoctrination has not been permitted in our public schools. And the schools themselves have served as a great unifying force in American life — welcoming youngsters of every creed, emphasizing the common heritage of all and serving as training grounds for healthful community living. Thus, the schools have performed an indispensable function, and any proposed departure which threatens to prevent them from fulfilling this traditional role must be weighed with the greatest caution.

Experience indicates that public consideration of church-state issues often engenders community tensions. Deep religious loyalties are stirred, and explosive and uncontrollable reactions displace calm and objective debate. Therefore, community groups bear a grave responsibility in addressing themselves to these problems.

It is hoped that this Statement of Views will stimulate thoughtful discussion, and help to keep the public schools free of sectarian strife.

V

RELIGION IN TEACHER EDUCATION

EUGENE E. DAWSON

Teacher Education and Religion Project, 1701 S. Broadway, Pittsburg, Kansas

IT IS HARDLY an overstatement to suggest that one of the most complex dilemmas to be discussed and debated over the years both in and out of American educational circles, has been the relationship of religion to education. For a very tangled skein of reasons, this problem has remained relatively unresolved.

It is certainly a truism to say that the academic climate, as far as the official acceptance of religion in higher education is concerned, has undergone many transitions since John Harvard made his initial contribution to Harvard College because he dreaded to leave an illiterate ministry to the Church when the ministers of his day had passed from the scene. Similar religious motives likewise led to the establishment of other early colleges. Historical records call to our attention the ceremony at the laying of the cornerstone of Old East Hall at the University of North Carolina in 1793; when the objectives of the University were defined as: "The enlightenment of the people, their instruction not alone in secular learning, but in religious truth." This is mentioned only to illustrate the religious interest which motivated American education in the embryonic stage of its development. For good or ill, these early religious intentions were unmistakably clear and sincere.

What we must remain cognizant of is that early educators as well as the fathers of our Constitution were, on the whole, devoutly religious men, but they had the ill-fortune of being persistently harassed by those who placed sectarianism above everything else. This not only formed a basis for constitutional restrictions but it has proved to be a paramount factor in motivating public institutions to frequently equate religion with sectarianism and to be somewhat dubious of the role of religion in education.

Meanwhile, in more recent years, we have

witnessed a new trend gathering momentum — namely a new interest and sensitivity to religion in higher education and, in fact, throughout our public school system. It seems likely that this interest will be extended during the next several years.

This is not necessarily the time to attempt an analysis of the multiplicity of factors responsible for this new concern. It may be pointed out, however, that the last devastating war, the ever-present threat of a new one, "the Hydrogen bomb," the awareness of our social retardation compared to scientific progress have all contributed to this concern.

As many will recall, the Educational Policies Commission of the National Education Association published a report on *Moral and Spiritual Values in the Public Schools* in 1951 which included these lines.¹ "When a point about religious opinion or religious practices arises in a classroom discussion, the teacher will not brush it aside with a statement that he is not allowed to discuss this matter in the public school. There can be no doubt that the American democracy is grounded in a religious tradition. While religion may not be the only source for democratic moral and spiritual values, it is surely one of the important sources. For this reason, if for no other, an attitude of respect toward religion should prevail in the public schools."

Under the heading, "The Public Schools Can and Should Teach About Religion," the Commission says,² "The public school can teach objectively about religion without advocating or teaching any religious creed. To omit from the classroom all references to religion and the institutions of religion is to neglect an important part of American life.

¹*Moral and Spiritual Values in the Public Schools*, 1951. p. 73.

²*Ibid.*, E.P.C. .pp. 77, 78.

Knowledge about religion is essential for a full understanding of our culture, literature, art, history, and current affairs."

I

As some readers may know, the American Association of Colleges For Teacher Education has had a definite and sustained interest in this question in recent years, and it was in 1952 that the Executive Committee of the Association took initial steps to organize a project in Religion in Teacher Education. Subsequently, the William H. Danforth Foundation, of which Kenneth I. Brown is the Executive Director, contributed a grant of \$60,000 for a two year period to be used in conducting the project. During the early months of 1953 a Teacher Education and Religion Committee was appointed, headed by Dr. John G. Flowers, President of Southwest Texas State College, San Marcos. Additional members of the committee include: Dr. Evan Collins, President, New York State University Teachers College, Albany; Dr. Walter W. Cook, Dean, School of Education, University of Minnesota; Dr. Charles W. Hunt, Consultant, A.A.C.T.E., Oneonta, New York; Dr. J. W. Maucker, President, Iowa State Teachers College, Cedar Falls; Dr. Robert Ulich, Harvard University, and Dr. Roscoe West, President of the New Jersey State Teachers College, Trenton. Dr. Kenneth I. Brown of the Danforth Foundation, Dr. Edward C. Pomeroy, Secretary-Treasurer of A.A.C.T.E., and the writer are ex-officio members of the committee. In addition, the committee has three permanent consultants, Dr. Samuel M. Blumenfield, President, (currently on leave) College of Jewish Studies, Chicago; the Rev. William E. McManus, Assistant Director, Department of Education, National Catholic Welfare Conference, Washington, D. C., and Dr. Seymour A. Smith, Assistant Professor Religion in Higher Education, Yale Divinity School. It should also be pointed out at this juncture that the Teacher Education and Religion Committee is actually a sub-committee of the Studies and Standards Committee, one of the vital committees of A.A.C.T.E. and reports to this committee periodically.

Essentially, what is the nature of the project underway? One of the initial tasks of the committee was that of developing a policy statement which has proved to be substantial throughout the early stages of the project. The statement reads as follows:

"The Committee recommends that the chief purpose of this study of teacher education and religion be to discover and develop ways and means to teach the reciprocal relation between religion and other elements in human culture in order that the prospective teacher, whether he teaches literature, history, the arts, science, or other subjects, be prepared to understand, to appreciate, and to convey to his students the significance of religion in human affairs."

It can be seen, therefore, that the primary aim of the study is to treat religion in an objective manner whenever and wherever it is relevant to learning experience in the various fields of study. It is not the aim of the project to encourage individual commitment on the part of students. It is the view of the committee that the emphasis on teaching about religion is the most practical for colleges concerned with teacher education and compatible to the various legal restrictions.

The inference to be drawn from the policy statement referred to previously is that education is incomplete without a consideration of the areas of religious relevance in the various curricular divisions.

As Gordon W. Allport of Harvard, one of America's leading psychologists, has pointed out in his book, *The Individual and His Religion*.

Modern empirical psychology initially separated itself sharply from religion. 'Psychology without a soul' became its badge of distinction and of pride. There was good reason. Too long had the understanding and cure of man's spirit been regarded solely as the province of religion and philosophy. In order to bring to bear the demonstrated merit of the scientific method and inductive thinking psychologists were forced to chart a new course. . . .

"At the same time there is inherent absurdity in supposing that psychology and religion, both dealing with the outward

reaching of man's mind, must be permanently and hopelessly at odds. . . . From many sides today comes the demand that religion and psychology busy themselves in finding a common ground for uniting their efforts for human welfare.

In seeking to trace the full course of religious development in the normally mature and productive personality, I am dealing with the psychology, not with the psychopathology of religion. The neurotic function of religious belief, its aid as an 'escape from freedom,' is indeed commonly encountered, so commonly that opponents of religion see only this function and declare it to dominate any life that harbors a religious sentiment. With this view I disagree. Many personalities attain a religious view of life without suffering arrested development and without self-deception. Indeed it is by virtue of their religious outlook upon life—expanding as experience expands—that they are able to build and maintain a mature and well-integrated edifice of personality."³

Turning to another discipline, Kenneth E. Boulding, Economist at the University of Michigan, writing in the book, *Religious Perspectives in College Teaching*, has said,

"The danger in the economic abstraction lies in its very success. I am not attacking abstraction as such—it is absolutely necessary if the huge complexity of human life-experience is to be reduced to manageable terms. . . . But because of its coherence, its beauty and its success, its practitioners—especially those skilled in mathematics—are apt to forget that it is an abstraction, and that it is men and not commodities that are the ultimate social reality. A good example of both the necessity and the danger of economic abstraction is found in the study of labor: unless we understand clearly that labor is a commodity, in spite of all pious pronouncements to the contrary, we shall never understand the phenomena of industrial relations. But we shall also not understand industrial relations unless we realize that labor is much more than a commodity and that the labor-bargain involves a complex

set of psychological, sociological, even theological relations out of which the commodity aspect is abstracted. . . .

It is at this point, I think, that the teacher whose acquaintance with religion is something more than second hand can be of great help to his students, not only as persons but also as economists."⁴

It may be pertinent also to recall a statement of Justice Douglas in the famous *McCollum vs. the Board of Education Case*:

"Perhaps subjects such as mathematics, physics or chemistry are, or can be, completely secularized. But it would not seem practical to teach either practice or appreciation of the arts if we were to forbid exposure of youth to any religious influences. Music without sacred music, architecture minus the cathedral, or painting without the scriptural themes would be eccentric and incomplete, even from a secular point of view. Yet the inspirational appeal of religion in these guises is often stronger than in forethought sermon. Even such a 'science' as biology raises the issue between evolution and creation as an explanation of our presence on this planet. Certainly a course in English Literature that omitted the Bible and other powerful uses of our mother tongue for religious ends would be pretty barren. One can hardly respect a system of education that would leave the student wholly ignorant of the currents of religious thought that move the world."⁵

What the Justice is contending and what the Teacher Education and Religion Committee is stressing is that the student cannot properly understand the culture in which he lives without an understanding of the religious institutions which are a part of that culture. He cannot fully understand history without a familiarity of the role of the various religions in history. A student is deficient in his understanding of literature unless he has become acquainted with some of the great literary masterpieces of a religious nature.

⁴Edited by Hoxie N. Fairchild, The Ronald Press Co., N. Y., 1952. Pages 379, 380.

⁵*McCullum vs. Board of Education*, 333 U. S. 203 (1948).

³Preface. p. 5, N. Y. The Macmillan Press. 1950.

At the same time, it should be pointed out that, while the committee is fully aware of the importance of sifting out the religious implications of presumably secular subjects, it is likewise sensitive to the forcing of a religious interpretation on non-religious material.

II

In the Fall of 1953, after appointing a Coordinator for the project, the Teacher Education and Religion Committee selected fifteen pilot institutions to participate from a list of fifty-nine making application. The schools invited were as follows: State Teachers College, Troy, Alabama; Arizona State College, Tempe, Arizona; Iowa State Teachers College, Cedar Falls, Iowa; Kansas State Teachers College, Pittsburg, Kansas; College of Education, University of Kentucky, Lexington, Kentucky; State Teachers College, Towson, Maryland; Western Michigan College of Education, Kalamazoo, Michigan; Division of Education, Macalester College, St. Paul, Minnesota; School of Education, New York University, New York, New York; State University Teachers College, Oswego, New York; East Carolina College, Greenville, North Carolina; College of Education, The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio; Oregon College of Education, Monmouth, Oregon; George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee; North Texas State College, Denton, Texas.

The committee, in selecting the schools, employed the following criteria: (1) institutional interest, (2) curriculum interest and strength, (3) type, (4) geographical location, (5) legal and cultural restrictions, (6) ethnic factors, (7) program coverage of the school, and (8) previous experience in religion and education.

During the first two years of the project which officially got underway in February, 1954, these fifteen schools will be concerned with developing new units in presently existing courses and in experimenting with the various ways in which teaching about religion may be related to teacher education curricula. To assist them in this activity, four workshops have been held and consultants in

the various disciplines as well as the coordinator of the project are visiting the campuses. Following this phase of the program, plans call for the materials to be gathered, evaluated and widely distributed for the benefit of other interested institutions.

It should be said that at this early stage of the project it is to be expected that some of the more significant objectives and activities on the part of participating schools are yet to be conceived and implemented.

III

Major interest in the Project, thus far, may be categorized roughly in three areas: general education, special courses in religion or units within courses in which the primary concern is religious literacy, and professional education.

As to the first area of interest, that of general education, such interest has been predicated on the philosophy that general education is incomplete which is devoid of the religious dimension, that if we are genuinely serious about educating the whole student, we must be sensitive in our teaching to the impact religion has made on our culture. Moreover, attention has been focused on the general education area because it is precisely at this point where most of the students in teacher education may be reached. Interest in relating the Project to the general education courses is being evidenced in all of the divisions of general education — the humanities, natural sciences, and social studies. In some instances, chairmen of general education committees are serving as local coordinators for the Project. In certain instances, general education committees are assuming major responsibility for the development of the Project on the local campus.

The second area of interest, that dealing primarily with religious literacy, is based on the thesis that one of the paramount needs of our prospective teachers is to become more religiously literate. As the Dean of one of the Schools of Education put it, "I can hardly conceive of my students going out to teach the whole child — to know the whole child, and at the same time remaining unfamiliar with the religious context in which the child lives."

The interest in professional education is revolving, for the most part, around philosophy of education courses, where, in certain instances there is a desire to see what may be done in the way of including a theistic emphasis in treating the various philosophies of education, and in certain problems and methods courses where the concern is that of training the prospective teacher to deal with the various problems relative to religion which arise in the classroom from time to time.

IV

As to the activities underway on the various campuses, reference should be made to the following: All fifteen centers, have by now, appointed Teacher Education and Religion Committees. On the whole, these are good committees, inter-disciplinary in nature and representative of good scholarship and sufficiently motivated. In a few institutions, faculty seminars have been underway for sometime in which sizeable groups of faculty members have been discussing the many and varied problems and possibilities related to teaching about religion. Participants have reported such sessions to be beneficial in that they have resulted in new insights and have facilitated a greater degree of communication and understanding among the participants.

In a few institutions, analyses of current courses are taking place or have occurred, to determine the extent to which teaching about religion is already taking place. This would appear to be a logical early step in a project of this kind.

In two or three institutions, new general education courses are being developed and through the impetus of the Project, a consideration of the religious dimension will be included in such courses.

On two or three campuses the local committees have devised and used opinionnaires to gain more information relative to student opinions and needs with respect to religion.

At some schools, committees are giving serious consideration to the possibility of establishing new departments and courses in religion. In other institutions, where such courses or units on religion within courses are already in existence further scrutiny and refinement of courses is already taking place.

At one institution there is an interest in studying the relationship of educational movies to the teaching about religion and the development of religious attitudes. It is the feeling of the local committee that it is difficult to investigate course structure without considering mass media and its effect on religious attitudes.

Two schools participating in the Project, held conferences this past summer for off-campus people for the purpose of not only gaining more understanding into the problems being faced by public school teachers but to inform teachers about the current Project.

One large School of Education concerned with the Project devoted its first two Summer Forums to the subject, "Teacher Education and Religion."

At still another school, the local committee made plans to hold a series of conferences during the school years, the first dealing with the humanities, the second with the natural sciences, the third with professional education and the last with the social sciences. Faculties and students from other colleges in the area have been invited to participate.

Finally, on another campus, several members of the faculty are contributing essays in which they describe ways in which they attempt to teach about religion in their respective courses.

Thus, it can be seen that while it is too early, as yet, to predict ultimate outcomes and to point to certain accomplishments as far as the Project is concerned, it is evident that there is considerable enthusiasm and concern on the part of participating schools. This sensitivity, in itself, affords a reasonable basis for encouragement.

VI

TEACHING SPIRITUAL VALUES IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

HERBERT F. A. SMITH

Mankato State Teachers College, Mankato, Minn.

THE PURPOSE of this work is to draw together some concepts from three aspects of high school teaching in order to see what conclusions, if any, present themselves, and to consider the worth of these conclusions.

The three aspects involved are: (a) Child development or, more specifically speaking, adolescent development, (b) The teaching of religious values in the public schools, (c) An inductive-deductive method of teaching these religious values in accordance with adolescent development.

Adolescent Development

The child development concept and the theory of maturation have been accepted, in many parts of this country at least, and in general the elementary schools govern themselves and organize their studies on the foundation provided by these theories. We have heard a great deal about child development beyond the elementary school level, too, and our educational psychology textbooks tell what is known about mental, physical, emotional and social development. Of these four fields, physical and social development have been cared for in most of our high schools. It is a matter of fact that physical education activities and social activities are accepted as part of the curriculum in many of the high schools throughout the country. These schools believe, and rightly so, that the attaining of a happy social adjustment by each child is of the highest importance. Strangely enough, the message of mental development has had fewer converts and the high schools, including some junior high schools, are proving to be somewhat slow in accepting child growth and development as the working foundation for curriculum building and practice. High school teachers, as a group, are much concerned about marks and

standards. Where it has become the practice to advance children according to age, the marks the children receive are very low and promotion comes in spite of, rather than because of, the work they do and the contribution they make. These practices cannot be hidden from the children and present many problems in the emotional area. Emotional development is recognized by our schools and, in some cases, real steps have been taken to foster a healthy growth. On the whole, though, our work is not very effective from this standpoint and there remains much to be done.

Four areas of adolescent growth have been mentioned — mental, physical, emotional, and social — each of which has received some attention in the high school of today. One area, though, has been entirely omitted, that of spiritual development. This development receives little, if any, attention in our books of educational psychology or of child development, nor is attention paid to it in college courses utilizing these text-books. It even appears, as a school system, we shut our eyes very deliberately to this aspect of adolescence. This omission constitutes a gap in the education of our boys and girls and such a gap must of necessity mean that the process of learning is incomplete and consequently ineffective. The writer knows that many teachers, as individuals, recognize the existence of this gap and make some attempt to bridge it by example and incidental teaching; they realize, however, that such attempts are feeble. They feel that their hands are tied and that they can do little that is positive and effective in the public school system. It is the writer's opinion that much can be done and will be done to provide for the spiritual development of our children in the decades immediately ahead and this will be done in the public school system.

Religious Values in the Public Schools

It is reported that, while one in every 200 pupils in the New York City schools is a revealed drug addict, in the Roman Catholic and other parochial schools of the same city not a single case of drug addiction has been found.¹ It is further reported, moreover, that the drug peddlers have stopped trying to push their wares in these institutions. It is not worth their time. This one fact is evidence to show where spiritual needs are met, boys and girls depend less on unwholesome answers to their needs. Children do not drink, drive dangerously, or become addicted to drugs because of the novelty of each act or because of social pressure to the extent that some would have us think. They do these undesirable things because they have needs and desires which they do not understand, and, not knowing the right or desirable answers since no one has shown them, they cast about for any answer and the release and excitement offered by drink and drugs, with attendant practices, offer an answer which some, not all, will accept. Their needs call for spiritual answers but the children are handed something far different.

There are those who believe, very sincerely, that the whole question swings on putting the Bible back into our schools.² In actuality, uncertainty, but it seems by interpretation, attorneys general or state superintendents exclude the Bible from the public schools of California, Nevada, Arizona, Wyoming, Utah, and upstate New York.) In other states it is kept from the schools by various groups who feel that the Bible itself, in the King James Version, is sectarian. The problem goes deeper, though, than the presence or absence of the Book itself in the school system. Kuhlen⁴ shows that a high similarity the Bible is kept out of the schools by law

in only half a dozen states:³ (There is some in moral knowledge exists between teachers and inmates of a reform school for women. He concludes that correct moral knowledge exists between teachers and inmates of a reform school for women. He concludes also that correct moral knowledge is a necessity, but not sufficient condition, for moral behavior. The question of the acceptance of the Bible in the public schools forms part of the problem but is not, in itself, the whole problem.

The real problem is that of building up mature concepts of right and wrong, of good and evil, in the minds of our boys and girls as these children mature. The concepts must mature along with the boys and girls and the experiences leading to these concepts, and those supporting them once they are grasped, must be acceptable to and in accord with the development of the individual. These experiences and these concepts must be made so that they form a strong and functioning factor on the personality of the adolescent boy or girl. It remains to determine the nature of the concepts and the type of experience which will lead to their comprehension.

A great step toward the objective outlined above has been made by Madden⁵ who has indicated how the values underlying religions throughout the civilized world have been realized and universalized by mankind. The values referred to are those expressed in the Ten Commandments and those taught by Christ. Madden feels that these values can be taught by means of creative social acts through which young people can realize the "religious quality potential" in shared experience and be thus guided to a sense of reverence for spiritual values. He states, moreover, that the common school, kept free of sectarian domination, is a proper institution for promoting that enterprise.

Inductive-Deductive Teaching

By the work presented by Madden, and by the great need evidenced by our boys and girls, there is now placed on the shoulders of

¹James C. G. Coniff. "Do Schools Teach Drug Addiction?" *Catholic Digest* XVI, 4 (February, 1952) pp. 1-6.

²W. S. Fleming. *God in Our Public Schools* Pittsburgh: National Reform Association, 1941.

³*Ibid.* p. 145.

⁴Raymond G. Kuhlen. *The Psychology of Adolescent Development*. New York; Harper and Brothers, 1952. p. 434.

⁵Ward Madden. *Religious Values in Education*. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1951.

teachers the responsibility of devising effective and acceptable techniques of teaching concepts of value and principles of behavior to our young people. This must be done, furthermore, within the public school and within a pattern which precludes sectarian domination.

This can be done. But it will not be done by a dominative, deductive system of teaching. Yet most of our high school teaching is both dominative and deductive. By dominative teaching is meant that type in which the teacher dominates the direction of the work done by the children and, beyond that, dominates each child in a person-to-person relationship. In a typical class, the teacher asks a question of one pupil and the pupil answers directly to the teacher. By deductive teaching is meant that type of teaching which presents the eventual idea of a train of thought to a child and then puts the child through various procedures by which he memorizes, tests, verifies, or applies the concept provided for him. The concept is not the child's, inasmuch as he had no part in the building of it. A portion only and not the whole.

As opposed to dominative teaching, integrative teaching is that type in which a class is organized into a group from which questions and answers come and by which conclusions are drawn and principles comprehended. The teacher guides and helps the group which is the class but does not impose ideas on individual members nor on the class as a whole. The opposite to deductive teaching is inductive teaching. In this latter method the child is presented with facts by means of observation, discussion, or reading, and then, using his own ability to see relationships between the facts, establishes conclusions. Discussion of conclusions by the child with his classmates and teacher tests them and modifies them until they are acceptable to the group. The portion teaching that is inductive supplements the portion which is deductive and thus we have an inductive-deductive system of teaching in which facts are presented and studied, relationships perceived, conclusions established

after testing and verifying, and finally, principles realized.⁶

The grist of facts essential to the operation of our teaching technique must come from the life situations of the pupils and those organizations which man has built up to provide these situations which have proved themselves suitable to the survival of the race. These organizations constitute the community which, for our immediate purpose, is defined as including small units, such as the family, and increasingly bigger units up to any global organization we may attain. The curriculum of the high school is to be a community based curriculum. That is, the community itself will be the center of study done by the boys and girls, as it is the center of the life which they live.

Division of the community into areas which can be handled practicably by a high school class offers no great difficulty.⁷ Let us consider, as an example, mutual protection against disease. Hospitals, sewage systems, sanitation departments, clinics, and drug stores offer many, many facts to be observed, recorded, and studied. Doctors, nurses, welfare workers, and others are glad to have the opportunity to present the facts of their work to young people. Current magazines, found in the homes of most of the children, present many fine articles dealing with the problem. The children can hardly miss the publicity given to the March of Dimes and the other such worthy causes. The conclusions drawn from such study, under expert guidance, are as sound as those learned from textbooks and far more meaningful, more useful, and hence, longer remembered. Would there not spring from such a study, too, discussions of responsibility to one's vocation, care of one's fellow man, honesty in government, and good neighborliness? Many other

⁶Herbert F. A. Smith. "A Determination of Principles and Experiments Desirable for a Course of General Science at the Junior High School Level." Doctor's dissertation, University of Michigan, 1950. Available at University Microfilms, Ann Arbor, Michigan. Report in *Science Education*, XXXV (December, 1951), pp. 279-86.

⁷—— "An Inductive Approach to Science Teaching through Photography." *Science Teacher*, XIX, 6 (November 1952). pp. 266-69.

values can be reached through other studies.

When the lessons reveal themselves during the discussions in studies such as the one outlined, can it be wrong to show boys and girls that the values they have perceived are the values by which man has elevated himself? Can we not indicate that Moses, or Christ, or Mohammed, or Confucius, perceived the same

value centuries ago and that the value has contributed to the happiness of mankind in the time intervening? We can do these things. And finally, we can lead boys and girls to associate their living with the values which have been established as those which lead to real happiness.

THREE LEVELS OF VALUE IN RELIGIOUS EDUCATION

HARLAND E. HOGUE

Carl Patton Professor of Homiletics, Pacific School of Religion, Berkeley, California

IN GEORGE SANTAYANA'S *The Last Puritan*, a none-too-subtle attack upon one tradition of religious value, Mario, the brilliant Eaton graduate, is talking with his older American cousin, Oliver, a graduate student at Harvard:

Your philosophy requires you to find a reason for everything? But do you know why you were born? Do you know what you are living for? Are you sure it's worth while? It just happens. Is anything in this world arranged as anybody would have wished—the mountains and rivers or our own bodies or our own minds? No: but we have to make the best of them as they are. And sometimes it's glorious work.

Here are the profound questions which every reflective person asks—the unsophisticated unconsciously; the sophisticated consciously. The responsible teacher, sensitively aware of these spoken or unspoken queries, seeks to relate the growing person to the most mature religious experience of man. But he finds himself at both the secondary and college level (and of course with post-college adults) handicapped by false, uninformed, or degraded emotional attitudes toward any 'type' of religion.

The Nature of Religion

Frequently it is helpful to begin with an arresting statement by a reputable scholar. Homer H. Dubs, Professor of Chinese Philosophy at Oxford says religion is 'the attitude that man takes to what he considers to be the most important.' William James in his distinguished Gifford Lectures said 'Religion is man's total reaction upon life.' If the clear statement of either Dubs or James makes sense, then it is obvious that the way a man answers the basic questions raised in *The Last Puritan* is his religion.

But our concern with communicating reli-

gious values requires clarification at two points: first, the student has often thought of religion exclusively within the framework of one of the major families of religion. He speaks of the differences of religion being the differences between Hinduism and Buddhism, or of between Judaism and Christianity. But when he gets inside any one of these traditions, he makes an astounding discovery. The differences *within* the tradition itself often seem of greater significance than some differences between major traditions. In Hinduism, for example, he has imagined that men in general must think alike, respond similarly in ethical attitudes, and have some common forms of worship. Then comes the great disillusionment. For he soon learns that within the framework of Hinduism one finds every level of ethical attitude from the degraded worship of phallic symbols to the high ethical and intellectual appreciations of a Gandhi, a Dasgupta or a Radhakrishnan.

A second difficulty is the assumption widely held in our Western culture that our classifications in religion are mutually exclusive. We say, for example, that religion is a set of beliefs. Yet in primitive religion there is often no possibility of any established set of beliefs, but the entire emphasis is upon external practice. Or again, we say that religion is a belief in a god or in gods. Yet Gotama Buddha was an agnostic and repudiated all Hindu deities. Or again, we say with Matthew Arnold that religion is 'a power not our own which makes for righteousness.' But in orthodox Hinduism there is no explicit relationship between religion and ethics. Or again, we say that religion is primarily empirical; and with William James and W. T. Stace we limit religion to mysticism. But in the *Bhagavad Gita*, the most revered religious poem of India, knowledge is one of the three most significant ways to salvation. Or again, we say that religion is a group

phenomenon. Yet here is Alfred North Whitehead with his celebrated statement that 'religion is what one does with his solitariness.'

We have suggested, then, these two basic errors among otherwise thoughtful people, when we begin the study of religion: (1) the assumption that the major differences in religious value are only the differences between great families of religions; and (2) that the categories in which religion is often studied are mutually exclusive. Since the student will find these two common errors amply illustrated in the reading from his primary sources during the year, it is well for him to see them quite candidly at the very beginning.

This will enable him to see with Dubs or James that religion is a factor in every life, and thus in every culture. But it is neither a personal nor a social 'good,' nor is it personal nor a social 'evil' simply because it is religion. Since all men take some attitude toward what they consider to be most important, all men are religious. But what is all-important is to see that there are *different levels of religion* which cut across the great families of religion, and across all the exclusive categories that men tend to set up in discussing the subject. Ikhnaton spent his career in Egypt attacking the prevailing religion of his culture. Confucius was vehement in his criticism of the prevailing religion of Central China. The Hebrew prophets were excoriating in their condemnation of the evils in religion from the 8th to the 4th centuries B.C. Jesus was so precise and so caustic against the loveless legalism of his day that one is shocked by the absoluteness of his language: ' . . . you serpents . . . you blind guides, straining out a gnat and swallowing a camel . . . you generation of vipers. . . .' In fact, one can make out a strong case that most of the Bible is an attack upon religion! The longer I teach the more profound is the statement attributed to Jesus in the Fourth Gospel: 'If the life that is in you be darkness, then how great is that darkness.'

Once we have a clear understanding, then, that the levels of religious value cut across all the major religious traditions; that religion is

neither something *per se* to be either defended or attacked, but first of all to be understood; then we are ready to approach the subject with at least some degree of objectivity. And I have found high school, college and graduate students equally willing and even anxious to view religion from the perspective indicated. Now to ask the question: "Is a man 'religious'?" or 'is a people 'religious'?" seems naive and irrelevant. Rather the only responsible question to ask is: 'what *kind* of religious attitude has he?' or 'what is the *nature* of religion in this society?'

To give focus to this study with a group of thoughtful students I am suggesting *three levels of religion*. They are not mutually exclusive. They are frequently and understandably found within the same person. This is often the basis of the divided self. These three levels are always found in any given social structure. And the levels are often intricately involved with one another. But, once we have a clear understanding of *each level*, we may assess it to some extent in each personality and in each culture. And as tendencies, these levels have their own validity. But the first two types have serious dangers potential within them, if they are uncorrected by the third.

Primary Religion

This is the first level of all religion; the most widespread level; the most universally understandable level. It is a religion of the satisfying of man's immediate wants. It may also satisfy his needs, but the two are not identical, but may often be in direct conflict. These wants are basic, elementary, determinative. Pearl Buck's *Good Earth* is a powerful novel because it portrays so vividly the necessity for land as the source of food and therefore of life. Religious devotion and symbolism, therefore, understandably arise in an unsophisticated society, where, without this basic security, one's life is constantly jeopardized. Not only land itself, but the food which comes from the land, becomes a basic element in religion. R. H. Fortune in *The Sorcerers of Dobu* describes the moving ceremonies in which men plant their yams in the light of the moon to assure the

basic necessities of life. Next to land and food comes shelter as a fundamental requisite of man. We are not surprised that the ancient Egyptians, ancient Babylonians, and ancient Chinese all had household gods, depicting man's anthropomorphizing of the hearth (regardless of how simple) which afforded him protection from man and beast. As a fourth want clothing was invested with religious meaning. Clothing for warmth, as a symbol of function in society, and for a special event (marriage or funeral) have often had unique significance. Health is a basic want, and within limits a basic necessity for any fullness of life. Orthodox Hebrew religion equated righteousness uncritically with perfect health. Orthodox Hinduism with its doctrine of *karma* equated one's degree of health or ill health with the absolute moral integrity of the universe. No one of the great families of religion has neglected the importance of these five aspects of life: land, food, housing, clothing and health as basic wants of man, and therefore often the center of man's loyalties.

There is a profound validity to this Primary Religion which every major faith has stressed appropriately. Whether one reads that moving description of her beloved Zuni in Ruth Benedict's *Patterns of Culture*; or, whether one has been stunned by seeing village women in Egypt pick up undigested seeds from the filth of village streets to be baked into cakes—this preoccupation of man with these elemental wants has deep-rooted meaning. Seen in its proper light Jesus' prayer is a perceptive recognition of this: 'Give us this day our daily bread.'

The validity of this Primary Religion needs to be understood clearly. But along with its validity, we need to recognize that no level of religion affords such a temptation for abuse. How, for example, shall a man or a society discriminate between basic 'wants' and basic 'needs'? Admitted, the 'need' of every baby in the world for a pint of milk a day. Does such a baby also 'need' economic security for life? a 'guaranteed standard annual wage'? a 'Rolls Royce'?

Here, the student of religious value sees the monstrous temptation which is potential

in every religion. There is the horrendous fact in every culture that there is a tendency to worship any power or force which *seems* to fulfill immediate *wants*. Whether it is 'waukon' (Zuni), anything that is 'wonderful'; whether it is Aaron's rod (Hebrew); whether it is Kali (Hindu) who befriends women; whether it is shamanism, fetishism, totemism; whether it is *The Power of Positive Thinking*—all these 'religious' symbols or techniques have certain common tendencies. They stand in grave danger of *using* religion to aid man in getting what he wants. They seek to bend the forces of history to magnify man's ego. They tend to exploit God. They have a tendency to exalt what is *done* as all-important; to minimize *why* it is done. They open the door for the religious professional (priest, shaman, medicine man) to exploit man's fear, to prey upon his basic needs, and thus manipulate people so that he (the priest) attains unlimited power. They have a tendency to destroy the line between religion and magic. This kind of religion to persist must be 'successful.' Thus it tends to reduce man's ultimate loyalties to the pragmatic and to the prudential.

Group Religion

A second level of value is that which has transcended the sanctification of the individual ego which is Primary Religion. On this level the loyalty goes beyond the self to the Group, although of course the two are constantly inter-related. If, in Primary Religion, the tendency is to satisfy a single man's immediate wants, in Group Religion the tendency is to satisfy a group's wants.

The first area of Group Religion is the tendency to identify the wants of the Family with some Absolute Truth. In Confucianism this has been a constant temptation, somewhat modified by the emphasis on nature in Taoism and by the universal ethical compassion in Mahayana Buddhism. In *Good Earth* the farmer took care of his aged father, his hostile aunt and uncle (whom he despised), his nephew (whom he knew to be devious)—but worthy or unworthy they were *Family*. In Hebrew religion the family unit was very powerful as the Fifth Com-

mandment emphasizes. In post-exilic religion with the immediate ties with the Temple broken in the Dispersion, the family was again raised to a prominence which had a tendency to absolutize itself. In Christianity Jesus continued much of this Jewish emphasis upon the importance of the family. He chose symbols of family life to illustrate faith: '... Our Father ... except you become as little children ... a certain man had two sons. ...'

Yet the dangers of absolutizing a group relationship—even so potentially creative a group as the family, has been apparent in the three traditions to which reference has been made. In Confucianism, the family has been both the strength and in some respects the gravest weakness of the tradition. It has made possible a double standard of morality in Chinese life. A friend of mine who taught philosophy in a Chinese University for 30 years reports that students who had an unfailing standard of integrity *within* their family, felt no qualms of conscience in cheating on examinations, and even stealing money or food, providing the motive was the enhancement of *family* prestige, or *family* security. In ancient Israel, this was probably not so seriously corrupted as in Chinese civilization. But the power of life and death over children was held by the parent, as illustrated by the intended sacrifice of Isaac by Abraham, by Jephthah's daughter, and by the children of Molech. In Christianity, some of Jesus' most poignant words were his expressions of concern over the absolutizing of the family loyalty, thus pre-empting the ultimate loyalty to God: '... Who is my mother and my brothers? ... Unless a man hate his father and mother he cannot be my disciple. ...'

The second group so frequently absolutized by religion is the ethnic, racial, economic or social group. In orthodox Hinduism, caste is the law of *Karma* in action, segregating men in rigid lines upon the basis of their 'just' deserts. In ancient China land was owned by families with hereditary rights. Medieval 'Christian' society sanctified the structure of society with the serfs never able to graduate from the economic and social slavery to which birth subjected them. Professor Radhakrish-

nan in a brilliant chapter points out the distinction between Caste (which he opposes) and Class (which he supports), the latter being a 'realistic' recognition that men are born with differing capabilities, and therefore their varieties of function in society should be recognized and clarified. Jesus' parable of the Talents seems to support this view.

But there is no chapter in the history of religion more replete with the perversion of human personality than that one being used to aid, abet and sanctify the continuous exploitation of one class in society by another in the name of some Absolute Value. The treatment of the untouchable in orthodox Hinduism, the attitude of 'enlightened intellectuals' in ancient Greece like Plato and Aristotle toward the 'barbarian,' the racism in the books of *Nabum* and *Esther* in the Old Testament, and the sanctification of the *status quo* politically and in economics in classical Lutheranism are known to every student of the history of religion. A part of the militant attack on desegregation comes from sincerely religious people who cling to the notion that the Negro is culturally inferior because of the eternal mandate of a just God.

The third group to be absolutized by religion is that of the State. In ancient China the Emperor ruled by virtue of his knowledge of the 'way of Heaven.' And though some Confucianists did insist that whenever the people were persuaded that Heaven's Way was being violated they might revolt, the history of China reveals that attitude was held more in theory than in practice. For ancient Israel the State was a product of a Divine Covenant, and therefore the King had an absolute power with cosmic sanctions which a relatively good king like David used magnanimously, but which a devious king like Ahab exploited for his own egocentric whims. Christianity from the time of Constantine to the 16th Century accepted formally a cosmic sanction to the government of the Roman Empire and its descendants. And the Mesianic notion of Manifest Destiny is not absent from American political thought.

The danger inherent in the notion that God has joined Church and State, and there-

fore man shall not separate it, is one of the darkest chapters in history. It is quite possible in modern China that had prophetic Confucianism been able to recover its critical ethical role, the Communist menace might have had a far more difficult time in subduing that vast nation. The Hebrew prophets again and again thundered against the abuse of power by government in the name of Yahweh. It is an open question whether in Constantine's time Christianity conquered Rome, or Rome defeated Christianity. In our own time, Prime Minister Malan has used the name of God piously and perhaps sincerely to liquidate any political rights for the Negroes of South Africa.

Advanced Religion

The third level of religious value, going beyond both Primary and Group Religion we shall call Advanced Religion. This recognizes what we have eagerly pointed out: there is an important validity to both Primary and Group Religion, providing they are subservient to Advanced Religion. And in this Advanced Religion there are three significant facets.

1. The Deontological emphasis: i.e., a concern with a Universal Moral Purpose. In contrast to Primary Religion which exalts the wishes of an individual ego; or of Group Religion which exalts the wishes of the group ego, Advanced Religion crosses all ethnic, racial, family, class, national lines, in a profound concern for a moral purpose which is universal and unfettered. The external act should always conform to the inner religious experience: Ikhnaton, Mencius, Thoreau, *The Cry of the Eloquent Peasant*, the Hebrew prophets, the Synoptic Gospels all include this emphasis.

But how is this Universal Moral Purpose to be known? Some religions believe through revelation to people sensitive to Divine Truth. To some, the ultimate standard is what previous generations have known through revelation, now put down in sacred writings. But these must be interpreted. Thus, we see developing in ancient Egypt, and in post-exilic Judaism a class of scribes and priests. These men tend to reduce Deontological Religion to Group Religion. There-

fore, this aspect of Advanced Religion can never stand alone; it must always be accompanied by the other two facets.

2. Soteriological Religion is the concern with Evil and its cure. Each man confronting the enormous weight of this unintelligible world' has three possible choices: (a) to give up, and take his life: suicide; (b) to attempt to forget, or to ignore reality through daydreams, and other forms of temporary escape; (c) to seek to understand Evil, to come to terms with it, to do something to destroy it, to limit it, to bear it, and especially to creatively and redemptively use it. In terms of mental and spiritual health we know that only the third is psychologically satisfying. Many of the profoundest religions have sought soteriological maturity: Egyptian religion with cosmic justice under Osiris; the Greek Mystery religions; Buddhism in its beginning; the Second Isaiah and *Job* in Judaism; and the Christian religion in its interpretation of the Cross.

3. The third aspect of Advanced Religion is that of its philosophical contribution. When man begins to think, to reflect, to ask questions about ultimate meanings, then he has to answer these questions in some kind of satisfying ideology. This is why philosophy and religion, if not married, are often seen together. (I am not suggesting that their romance is untroubled. Often they have violent and protracted quarrels: like contemporary Positivism and Neo-orthodoxy!) But it is true that philosophic religion tends to emphasize some coherent expression of religion; it tends to appeal to men's rational natures; it tends to universal concepts which transcend either Primary or Group concerns.

But this philosophic aspect of Advanced Religion may have serious limitations. Born in metaphysical speculation, it may live and end there. Its appeal to the rational faculties, and not the whole man, seriously limits its influence. It tends to an over-emphasis upon the theological splitting of hairs, often at the neglect of ethical responsibility. It tends to lose a high empirical concept of God in vague abstractions as has occurred in much of Plotinus and Taoism. Its emphasis upon creed-

making often leads to an absolutizing of one theological statement of one generation as the final and arbitrary and full expression of man's spiritual experience for all generations.

Thus Advanced Religion must be comprehensive if it is to be adequate. Deontological, Soteriological or Philosophical aspects by themselves can be lop-sided, arbitrary and devisive. The 'ideal' Religion would be an Advanced Religion where its Primary and Group loyalties were kept in subordination, but given their wholesome place; and where the Deontological, Soteriological and Philosophical segments were to have equal emphasis.

Our Role as Teachers

It is apparent that our role of teachers of religion is an exacting responsibility. We must have some familiarity with the history of religion; with the philosophy of several of the major families of religion; with at least some of the best literature of religion; with the most mature psychology of religion. Such a gargantuan preparation may frighten the young teacher. But the task is not hopeless. Fortunately we are not the first to have traveled the path. Thousands of devoted scholars and specialists have illumined our

field. And in allied studies thousands of fellow-scholars, public school administrators and teachers are often fruitfully helpful. Add to this company the poets, artists, and innumerable men and women of genuine religious experience — some of modest station in life — and we experience what the writer of *Hebrews* knew: to be surrounded by a cloud of witnesses.

We end where we began. A Harvard Freshman raises questions and states some convictions:

Your philosophy requires you to find a reason for everything? . . . Is anything in this world arranged as anybody would have wished — the mountains and rivers or our own bodies or our own minds? No: but we have to make the best of them as they are. And sometimes it's glorious work.

To see a young person, for whom the spiritual life has meant nothing, or only Primary Religion, discover for himself the inadequacy of *this level*; then to watch him grow; and then discover that even Group Religion is not enough. And then, in faith, to see him reach out for an experience of God expressing itself in the completeness of Advanced Religion *is* the frequent experience of the teacher of religion. And it's *glorious work*.

PRAYER AND WORSHIP RE-EXAMINED

ROSS SNYDER

Associate Professor of Religious Education, Chicago Theological Seminary, Chicago, Ill.

MAN'S CRY "save me" is one form of prayer that will never be shut off, nor should it be.

However this authentic cry often degenerates into what — if put into words — would become this prayer. "O God, protect and save me from the consequences of my living. Do thou, O Lord, take away the consequences of my constant violation of the truth; allow me to go on hating my neighbor; allow me to live irresponsibly . . . but thou O Lord canst prevent the results of all this living; do thou now save me from it."

Unfortunately too much of our prayer is at this level and too much of forgiveness extended by the minister is a cheap forgiveness. It is a forgiveness extended to those that are sick over the consequences of their sin but have not truly turned from the far country nor desire reconciliation with God. This kind of prayer and the kind of worship which extends a cheap forgiveness to such people makes no sense to me personally.

II

Another kind of worship and prayer which is not meaningful to me personally is that which stems from the assertion that God demands of us praise and adoration; and that it is the duty of man to render this either each day or once a week at 11 o'clock on Sunday morning. It seems to me that this is asserting that God will sulk unless he receives praise, adoration and thanks. This view is too near the ancient Roman custom whereby the retainers of a lord were accustomed to come each morning, pay their respects to him, thank him for what he had done, praise his wonderful omnipotence, bounty and wisdom and then insert a petition for that which would be good for them. This Roman habit stems from other habits way back in history but the analogue by which we picture God is the same . . . that of a potentate of autocratic power who governs

by whim and personal liking and who must be served up regularly praise by one who asks special petitions. Further this particular concept makes of prayer and worship a good work which is performed really for one's own benefit and therefore comes within the irreligion so detested by Luther.

III

Nor can I get much meaning out of prayer and worship whose purpose is to influence God, to cause him to do things which he otherwise would not do. It seems to me that the processes of the universe will go on whether I will them or not, but I do have the possibilities of determining something of their localized action by my own openness to them. So that prayer is the endeavor on my part to recover that kind of openness which will allow God to work in and through me. It is I who need the changing, not God. In its worst "errand boy" form this prayer of asking God to do things has been classically put by Auden:

"O God, put away justice and truth for we cannot understand them and do not want them. Leave Thy heavens and come down to our earth of waterclocks and hedges. Become our uncle. Look after baby, amuse grandfather, escort madam to the opera, help Willy with his homework, introduce Muriel to a handsome naval officer. Be interesting and weak like us, and we will love you as we love ourselves."

I also have difficulty with prayer and worship as the means of causing things to happen in the external world. Granting the humanness involved in the desperate cry of a people to God for rain when their crops are being ruined because of lack of water . . . and really believing that what one fundamentally is feeling on the inside should be expressed in prayer and worship — I would not see this as a very important means of causing rain to fall.

IV

There is however within the custom of the rain dances of the southwest Indians a kernel of something very important. It was their feeling that if rain is not falling, somehow or other things had gotten out of harmony between man and the Great Spirit; that action was needed to restore the order of this bi-polar world. Once the right relationship and order was reestablished, then the good would come. It could come with the renewal of the proper working of the relationship. This seems to me to be an interpretation similar to that which the Hebrews made. National disasters were a call to look to their relationship with God, to discover what had gone wrong with it, to return back to the solid covenant relationship with him. They were confident that if this relationship were established, the concrete events would be taken care of. The open relationship to God was the issue. And later it became clearer to them that it was the central value, regardless of the "success" of the concrete event of their history.

V

Perhaps it would be important to explain the world view in which a concept of prayer and worship here being developed would fit.

In quite general terms it seems to me that this must be a field theory of the universe, as well as of personal existence. Meaning by "field theory" that we live in a world in which everything is interpenetrating; in which there are not separate bits of matter which exist in and of themselves, with impenetrable gulfs between them and unrelated to each other. To be sure there is evidence of individual discreteness. It is necessary in understanding our physical universe to speak of quanta—discrete organizations of life. But also we must speak in terms of waves of energy, not of solid substance. The nearest we can come to stating the reality of the physical universe is to state it either in terms of free-flowing energy . . . existing in interdependent fields.

Now if this should be true of the physical universe how much more is it true of the world of person . . . of man as a psychological existence.

Man at the personal level lives also in the field of the symbolic, the world of awareness, the world of dialogue with self. This can perhaps best be expressed by saying that he is *spirit*. Utilizing the field theory, it then seems to me that *man* exists only in a field of the personal—and that he who is aware of and remains open to this field quality will live most vividly and in greater dimension. Above all creatures, man lives in an *interpenetrating world*.

To be sure he also has more than any other form of life the ability to set up barriers and walls to prevent the operation of the field within which he lives and moves as a person. But worship is properly seen as man's attempt to return to a state of openness to this field of which he is a small subsistence. He is not going to influence very much its enduring characteristics or even all its behaviors and actions in the concrete events of his life, but he does have a creative part in this action, as well as the ability to resist it and prevent its action and behavior.

Therefore I find the concept of God as the ground out of which comes the personal as a very attractive view of our personal world. This is to say that God ought not be seen as another localized individual consciousness in the world at some point, but rather the personal field out of which we emerge, and by which we continue to be grown and renewed. And since this quality of the universe is even more invisible to our common sense than the invisible energy which is the physical world, we make statements about it and symbols of it, rather than point to it and hold it in our hands.

VI

Now it seems to me that this ground of all personal life can be interacted with most helpfully by us through the very concrete forms of personal life in which it has been expressed. For we have come to know the character of this kind of God largely through concrete personal life. Once we become sensitive to it through this kind of exposure perhaps there are other possibilities of encounter.

Therefore prayer and worship begin as an

act of entering into and interpenetrating the personal concreteness that is available to me.

Now it seems to me that there are two classes of the personal with which I am to interact. First are the people immediately around me. If I am unable to enter reverently into their life, if I cannot carry on transaction of spirit with the people around me, then obviously I have no real power of entering into another life. And therefore I am cut off from the second — which is the entering into and interaction with persons and events not geographically but only symbolically present.

In both these situations I have something of the dimensions of revelation. I have a sense of being confronted and grasped by the mystery other than my own (but I'm aware of my own also.) And this grasping hits with such force that there is the condition of ecstasy within me. My emotions and awareness are really shaken, colored and conditioned by this encounter.

I personally find this kind of experience happening to me as I read or listen to people who have lived with intensity and integrity.

VII

Therefore I am forced to try to understand how is it that words are a carrier of *spirit*. How is it possible that through words I encounter the personal of a life "dead" years ago?

The best I can do is to say that after I myself have been awakened to personal life, that there are certain kinds of writings that seem to have this depth to them. There is a person back of and within these words whose presence is communicated to me, whose depth of mystery is before me as I read with sensitivity. And as I read, there actually is a transaction going on between me and this person of perhaps centuries ago. Even though such individual is not geographically present I am grasped and shaped by this which I encounter. This sometimes is a quite mystical experience, at other times a mere matter of fact impact upon me of words which symbolize a very important depth of my own experience, only partially awakened until this symbol came along to start it in motion and organize it.

This kind of worshipping is entering into another life through the symbols which carry it. At the same time it is an entering into the depths of my unconscious. We do have a "beyond that is within." We have endless potentialities and possibilities that are to be awakened and brought into our conscious self.

VIII

Therefore I can believe in the Quaker Doctrine of the Inner Light. I have depth of spirit and mystery. To some degree I am of the image of God. I too am spirit. I too am freedom. And a transcendence over what I I already am, and from the impersonal order of the universe. And this happens partly through the awakening of this depth and mystery within myself by worshipping.

However, it is possible that the doctrine of the Inner Light can lead one to feel that the Inner Light is confined to one's self. And so, by following its leading, one is shut up within his own present partial grasp of the whole truth. The whole energy of the field in which I live is either unknown or ignored. That is one of the reasons why the worship of entering into the experiences of another person is a necessary form of prayer and worship. The Inner Light is in others also. Light is a field existence. Transactions between the Inner Light which is in myself (and is also of the field) and the spirit and light of the larger field in which my life is immersed must keep going on.

IX

It seems to me that most people see the desirability of reverently "entering into" life other than their own — and that God may be found in personal concreteness, rather than "up in the air." And that they could come to see this as worship.

Does not this approach also lead us to awareness of a ground of personal spirit that is hidden deep within us (and the universe); and of worship as direct transaction with that Ground?

Worship is "return" from a far country where one lives estranged. Worship is encounter with the personal which awakens powers and transcendence within us. It is

reverently "entering into" a life other than one's own. It is transaction—an actual interchange of energy which involves openness on the part of the pray-er. (Adam and Eve are no longer hiding, but out in the open carrying on naked dialogue with God).

X

All these aspects are compounded in corporate worship. In corporate worship I am present with people whose lives interpene-

trate mine, and it is this living network that is at worship. Also as a worshipper I reverently enter into the lives of people who have lived with greatest passion and integrity. And thirdly there is this sense of the numinous actually being present as the ground of our life together and of my own personal life. Therefore corporate worship, if it is so conceived and experienced, has distinctive quality and power.

THE INDIANA PLAN FOR RELIGIOUS ADULT EDUCATION

PAUL BERGEVIN and JOHN McKINLEY
Community Services in Adult Education, Bloomington, Indiana

THE INDIANA PLAN for Religious Adult Education is a flexible approach to some of the problems of adult education in local churches. It is not a panacea nor a step-by-step blueprint of what must be done. It is, however, a tested framework within which significant church programs can evolve. The length of time required to develop a self-sustaining program would depend upon the size and unique characteristics of the congregations involved.

The whole Plan is a vehicle which people can use to get at the major goals of the Church: increased understanding of and participation in the worship, the work, and the witness of the Church. The immediate program goals of the Indiana Plan are three in number; they point towards the major goals in terms of specific individual responsibilities:

1. To stimulate adults to *recognize* that some of their common religious education needs can be met through educational programs in which they share responsibility and explore their relationships with God, other persons and themselves.
2. To assist lay people to *accept* a share of responsibility for devising and conducting educational programs to meet their recognized religious educational needs.
3. To encourage people to *use* their religious educational opportunities to understand a basic Christian doctrine and to interpret their talents actively through the Church and the whole human community.

The Indiana Plan develops in any church through three phases which we might describe as (1) Starting the Program, (2) Expanding the Program, (3) Consolidating the Program. The way in which these phases develop and the length of time required to develop them vary with the nature of the unique

situation (see the last section of this article entitled "Flexibility"). Since the purpose here is to describe these phases in general terms, no attempt will be made to explain all possible contingencies.

Starting the Program

After the project has been cleared through any regional channels that may exist, the consultant from Community Services first contacts the minister of the church. Together they view the program and plan how it might be best adapted to the people, the problems, and the organizational structure of that particular church. It is well to emphasize at this point that the program is unique to a particular situation—that it differs somewhat in character, depending on the educational needs of the church involved.

Next, from the minister's suggestions, a group of parishioners (not to exceed twenty) are selected to start the program, and meet with the consultant and the minister and discuss the Indiana Plan in general—its aims, methods, and possible results.

The first training step in the developing program occurs when the consultant administers a Training Institute for Group Discussion Leaders and Participants. The use of group discussion as a learning device is explained and demonstrated during the first session. Supervised practice in leading and participating in group discussion is emphasized at the next one or two meetings, usually held one or two weeks apart.

Next the members of the group (1) choose a religious educational need that they themselves recognize and wish to explore through the medium of group discussion and (2) explore that need, with the help of the minister and other resource materials, for a number of meetings (usually 6 to 14 one and one-half hour sessions). For the consultant this is a period of close supervision. Each meeting

is followed by a critique in which the consultant and the group discuss how the group functioned as a learning team.

The use of group discussion as the first step in an expanding church program is no accident. This basic tool is an excellent medium to induce change in the individual and to help him retain the new habit pattern. No one would deny that religious education seeks to change individuals. More specifically, group discussion training is the first step in the Indiana Plan for three reasons:

1. A vital church discussion group has a special significance; it is a segment of the church-family, and when in operation it is an opportunity for participants to observe, establish and discuss frankly the actual human congregational-family relationships that they experience in the group.

In the analogous domestic family circle we get out of ourselves and establish frank relationships; it is a small enough, familiar enough group to allow us to grasp its reality, and in it we all at times discuss openly the self-centeredness, forgiveness, rejection, hostility, cooperativeness, and sacrifice that occur in any group situation. We examine ourselves as a family group and see how we do or should relate to the others in the family.

In the church-family, part of the larger family of God, we cannot often do this because the whole congregation is too large to exist as a familiar group. Thus church or congregational-family relationships are often mere words—elusive, empty of meaning, known to exist, of course, and the social gatherings held for the purpose of “Christian fellowship” are often meant to foster the family-of-God feeling. Usually, however, these meetings do not purposefully get at the realities of how people actually relate to each other in God’s family.

The discussion training group becomes a familiar group that gets at these realities; it is small enough and purposeful enough to allow participants to establish and discuss true congregational-family relationships. Talking about them in

post-discussion critiques is inevitable, since these human relationships are the very factors which control the development of the group as a creative, cooperative learning team. Understanding how we relate to ourselves and others is part of understanding how we relate to God. We approach this objective through a process of growth towards maturity.

And so it can be readily seen that the discussion group phase of training is more than the organizing of a conventional “subject-centered” study group.

2. Subject matter is, of course, important, but not as a series of prescribed intellectual propositions that people memorize. In a mature discussion group, participants can identify some real needs they themselves recognize and bring to bear upon them the teachings of the Church. The discussion group is *one kind* of educational opportunity for people to corporately explore known religious truths in terms of everyday experience so that they can better understand the significance of these religious truths in terms that are meaningful to them.

Learning to use this tool means learning to accept the responsibility of working together creatively and humbly to erase common misunderstandings and ignorance.

3. The skills and understandings developed by leading and participating in group discussion lead naturally into the expansion of the program. The major religious educational problems that exist in a discussion group are the same educational growth problems that face an entire congregation (communication, the need for responsible participation, clear goals, evaluation, and meeting recognized needs). In a mature discussion group these problems can be clearly recognized and dealt with. Having learned the value of responsible participation in the learning process, of cooperativeness, of other-person-centeredness, of accepting personal responsibility for group success, the group is better equipped to learn how

to use other group-educational tools for broadening the program in the church.

Expanding the Program

Expansion of the program is an outward movement of its influence into the larger circle of parish life. It is not exclusively a quantitative process of drawing larger numbers of people into discussion groups. Expansion cannot be measured numerically because it involves both quantity and quality. Take, for example, a church of 40 parishioners of whom 20 are engaged in the program training. Expanding the program would not necessarily consist of drawing the other 20 people into a discussion group. It might instead take the form of improving the church library, or the general functioning of the educational programs of the governing body of the local church, the women's organizations, an annual congregational meeting, church-family suppers, Lenten programs, or the adult Church School. To improve an already established "learning-together" situation in a church is as important an aspect of expansion as is creating new learning situations to meet unmet needs.

The question is, how can a provisional¹ group of trainees attack some of these needs? Obviously, the training group cannot tamper with the educational activities that are controlled by autonomous organizations in the church. Expansion, then, must take place in two ways: (1) through the efforts of individuals in the training group who use new insights in the various established organizations and planning groups to which they belong, and (2) through the training group's influence as a planning and action group in the congregational activities of religious education.

Before expanding, the training group must know where to expand in the educational structure of the congregation and should have some additional skills and tools that will make expansion possible. This involves learning how to plan effectively, and how to use combinations of devices and resources that are appropriate to a given educational situation. The training group learns how to plan and

to use these tools, over a period of time by attacking actual educational needs of the congregation.

The first step, then, in organized expansion occurs when the training group and the minister identify some of the recognized adult educational needs of the church. (A brief informal survey of members of the congregation is often helpful.) From this list of recognized needs one or two are isolated as feasible for immediate attack. These needs usually fall into two categories: (1) improving the mechanics of existing educational situations, and (2) exploring suggested topics, either in existing learning situations or in proposed ones.

Having selected an area of need, the planning group (1) identifies some subtopics (if it is a subject need) and sets practical learning goals, (2) chooses the best available resources, and (3) the best combination of group devices to meet the goals, and (4) weaves them into a program or a series of educational experiences. The consultant guides these planning meetings carefully, emphasizing the local adaptation of appropriate resources and devices as means of reaching goals. After these programs have been conducted and evaluated, some of the other needs identified previously may then be attacked.

The first time it is experienced by a group, the planning process usually requires three or four weekly two-hour meetings. Needless to say, this is a fruitful learning experience for the training group, not only because it extends the trainees in responsible service beyond the ego-centered confines of the discussion group, but also because it gives them a perspective of the educational problems of the church and is an opportunity for them to relate themselves with new insights to the larger family circle of the congregation.

Expansion, then, includes such things as:

- (1) Learning how to use some effective tools and techniques for religious adult education.
- (2) Improving established learning situations.
- (3) Creating needed learning situations.
- (4) Increasing participation in religious adult education experiences.

¹Starting groups are not always provisional. See section entitled "Flexibility."

Consolidating the Program

The word *consolidating*, as used here, means making use of what has happened with an eye towards establishing the program more firmly for the future. This phase is not in an absolutely fixed position; consolidation does not always begin after, and separate from, a period of expansion. It merely describes four functions that help stabilize the program developing in a church. Brief explanations of each function will indicate their importance and how they usually fit into the time sequence of a developing program.

1. *Training more people in group discussion.* Normally the expansion efforts will arouse the interest of other people or of established organizations; these should be trained in the use of the basic device. Here the program comes full circle, for the new starting groups may proceed through the same three phases as did the original group. In some cases, a small number of new people may be integrated into the original one or two groups. Sometimes a new group becomes interested and starts discussion training before the original trainees expand.
2. *Clinic training for lay leaders.* Periodically three-day clinics are conducted by Community Services for lay leaders who have experienced at least the "Starting" phase of the program. To these meetings come from 15 to 30 persons representing 4-8 different congregations. These are true clinics in the medical sense of the word; the "body" being examined and analyzed is the Indiana Plan as it exists in the church represented. The people share their unique (and yet similar) problems of expanding and consolidating. Goals, methods, resources, and special problems are explored *by the group*, with emphasis on what their needs are at that point.
3. *Evaluating the program to date.* Evaluation is built in as a necessary part of the educational process in each phase. However, after expansion has taken place, or after the program has been in operation

for a period of 6-9 months, it is time for all concerned to look at the program development in perspective in terms of the major goals of the Church so that it can be better adjusted to the educational needs of the whole congregation. This evaluation is a necessary prelude to the next step.

4. *Planning next year's program.* The careful evaluation and the planning of the future task of the program in the church are projects that often occupy the summer months, since programs that begin in the fall normally evolve through all three phases by early summer. In any event, the planning should involve, in some way, all interested persons who have participated in the program.

Flexibility

Churches have unique organizational structures, institutional habits, and personal problems, and these must be taken account of when the minister and the consultant adapt the Indiana Plan to a given church. Since the composition of the original training group, for instance, will affect the way in which the program expands in the church, it is important to begin with people who will ultimately be the most successful agents of expansion. Sometimes these people are already organized into an established group. Thus, while it is best, if possible, to offer the training initially to everyone in the congregation, it is not always feasible or possible to do so.

The local needs and interests as the minister sees them, together with potential channels of expansion, are decisive factors in successfully adapting the program to a local church. Broadly speaking, it is advantageous (but not absolutely necessary) to start with people of both sexes and various age groups. For example, training groups may be composed of (a) members of an established organization such as a Women's Guild or Circle, (b) members of an existing church planning committee, (c) representatives of all established church organizations and service groups, (d) church school teachers, or (e)

any mixed group of interested persons who sincerely wish to start the program.

Another aspect of flexibility in the "Starting" phase lies in the choice of topics which the training group discusses during the first 2-5 months of practice sessions. There is no prescribed material. The religious educational needs and interest recognized by the participants and their minister determine the topics and subject materials.

The expansion phase also must be flexible enough to accommodate the unique characteristics of the congregational situation. There is no series of steps that set forth specifically what must happen. If there is resistance to improving established learning situations, then the training group may create new learning situations to meet unfilled needs. If this is resisted, expansion may take place through an extension of group discussion and a temporary broadening of the first phase, or by arousing interest through organizational programs. Cases of arrested development do not always indicate that the

program has failed, but usually that the means of expansion peculiar to that situation have not been found.

During any interim, expansion through the individuals of the training group goes on. Their sharpened awareness of the importance of clear goals and purposes, active participation, evaluation, and church-family relationships has an undeniable effect in the organized life of the Church.

A Final Word

This is no miracle plan concocted to revitalize a church. It can, over a period of time, have a significant effect upon the religious educational life of a church and community, but not because it is a "lay movement." *It is not a lay movement.* Successful use of this vehicle in a church requires the sincere cooperation of a minister who has established rapport with his congregation. He is at once a guide and a growing member of the learning team in every phase of the program.

Significant Evidence

ERNEST M. LIGON

Professor of Psychology, Union College

WILLIAM A. KOPPE

Research Associate, Union College

The purpose of this column is to keep religious educators abreast of the relevant significant research in the general field of psychology. Its implications for methods and materials in religious education are clear. Religious educators may well take advantage of every new finding in scientific research.

Each abstract or group is preceded by an evaluation and interpretative comment, which aims to guide the reader in understanding the research reported.

All of these abstracts are from PSYCHOLOGICAL ABSTRACTS, and used by permission of that periodical. The abstract number is Volume 28, Numbers 7-8, July-August, 1954.

I. ABSTRACTS RELATED TO DEVELOPMENTAL PSYCHOLOGY

These two studies explore some of the aspects of family life important to the developing child.

5717. BEELER, SARA. ANGRY GIRLS: BEHAVIOR CONTROL IN LATENCY. *Smith Coll. Stud. Soc. Wk.*, 1953, 23, 205-226. — In an effort to delineate the factors contributing to faulty behavior controls in school age children, a group of impulsive (uncontrolled) children were compared with an inhibited (overcontrolled) group. The impulsive group displayed mainly acting out symptoms while the inhibited were mainly withdrawn. The two groups overlapped both in symptomatology and in developmental history. The inhibited tended to have parents who were overcontrolled, while the impulsive had parents who differed among themselves and were predominantly impulsive. — G. Elias.

5756. STOLZ, LOIS MEEK, ET. AL. FATHER RELATIONS OF WAR-BORN CHILDREN. Stanford, Calif., University Press, 1954, viii, 365. p. \$4.00. — Using interviews with the fathers and mothers, observation of the children in group situations, and the children's responses in 5 projective play interview situations, the behavior of 19 families in which the father (1) was a World War II armed participant, (2) was absent from his family during at least the first year of life of his first-born child, (3) was a student or staff member at Stanford Univ., and (4) was united with his family at the time of the study, was compared with that of 51 control families meeting all the criteria except father absence. Statistically significant and clinically suggestive differences are reported with respect to the parents' behavior and insights, the behavior of the war-born children and their siblings, and the various interpersonal relationships. 99 references. — T. E. Newland.

This pamphlet is important to those working with children.

5728. FOSTER, CONSTANCE J. DEVELOPING RESPONSIBILITY IN CHILDREN. Chicago, Ill.: Science Research Associates, 1953. 48 p. 40c. — The author maintains that responsibility is something that has to be learned. One of the important items in training the child in responsibility is the timing thereof. The child likes to do things independently. His interests will create opportunities for teaching responsibility. Praise goes a long way in getting children to work cooperatively. There may be times when criticism is necessary but it should be of a constructive nature. Pushing the child too hard may be just as erroneous as expecting too little of him. — S. M. Amatora.

II. ABSTRACTS RELATED TO OLD AGE AND MATURITY

The adjustment of the increasing number of aged continues as an important problem in psychology.

5763. BURGESS, ERNEST W. (U. Chicago, Ill.) SOCIAL RELATIONS, ACTIVITIES, AND PERSONAL ADJUSTMENT. *Amer. J. Sociol.*, 1954, 59, 352-360. — 64 residents of two dwelling halls in Moosehaven, a community of retired members of a fraternal order, were classified as isolates by bilateral exclusion, isolates by unilateral exclusion, intimates with one person, intimates with two or more persons, and leaders. Participation in recreational activities was largest in those defined as solitary, followed in order by those classified as group spectator, and audience. Leaders had the highest score on recreational activities and in personal adjustment, and isolates by bilateral exclusion had the lowest. Men with the highest happiness scores take part nine times as much in group recreation as do those with the lowest. — D. L. Glick.

5769. HAVIGHURST, ROBERT J. (U. Chicago, Ill.) FLEXIBILITY AND THE SOCIAL ROLES OF THE RETIRED. *Amer. J. Sociol.*, 1954, 59, 309-311. — Between the ages of 50 and 75 individuals undergo great changes in their social roles. Intensified social roles include those of homemaker and church member. Reduced roles include those of worker,

parent, and spouse after the death of the partner. Older people may become more active as citizens, as members of the extended family and of informal groups, and as cultivators of hobbies. Conditions making for flexible adaptation to new roles are successful experience in a variety of roles during the middle years and deliberate cultivation of flexibility after the age of 50. — D. L. Glick.

5777. MICHELON, L. C. (U. Chicago, Ill.) THE NEW LEISURE CLASS. *Amer. J. Sociol.*, 1954, 59, 371-378. — Study of a retired and semi-retired group in a small trailer park in Florida suggests these hypotheses: (1) there is an inverse correlation between a person's adjustment to his job and his probable adjustment to retirement; (2) hobbies frequently recommended to working persons are isolating and will not necessarily facilitate adjustment to retirement; (3) isolating hobbies contribute to adjustment in retirement when the community contains many and varied stimuli for social intercourse, such as are provided in a mobile-home community; (4) satisfying substitutes for work may be found in a wide range of planned activities carried on in this type of community; (5) evaluation instruments and preretirement counseling techniques to measure the individual's predisposition of adjustment in retirement might be developed. A "Personal Retirement Inventory" and a hypothetical formula for measurement of predisposition to success in retirement are suggested. — D. L. Glick.

5783. TUCKMAN, JACOB; LORGE, IRVING, & SPOONER, GEORGE A. (Teachers Coll., New York.) THE EFFECT OF FAMILY ENVIRONMENT ON ATTITUDES TOWARD OLD PEOPLE AND THE OLDER WORKER. *J. soc. Psychol.*, 1953, 38, 207-218. — "This study of individuals within a family unit confirms previous findings that there is substantial acceptance of the cultural stereotypes about aging and indicates that the home environment contributes considerably to the similarity in attitudes between parents and between parents and their children. The acceptance of the cultural stereotypes about age is indicative of the kind of adjustment the parents have made to their own aging, and of the negative way in which both parents and children anticipate their adjustment to the consequences of aging in the future." — J. C. Franklin.

III. ABSTRACTS OF SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY

The implications of this study are far reaching. Are youth generally emotional "war casualties"?

5741. LOGAN, R. F. L., & GOLDBERG, E. M. (Manchester U., England.) RISING EIGHTEEN IN A LONDON SUBURB. A STUDY OF SOME ASPECTS OF THE LIFE AND HEALTH OF YOUNG MEN. *Brit. J. Sociol.*, 1953, 4, 323-345 — 74 of all eighty-five 18-year-old men who resided in an outer London borough presented themselves for interviews, questionnaire completing, and clinical examinations intended to assess their physical, mental, and social health. The youth appear to be physically fit but emotionally insecure, gaining little satisfaction from either work or leisure, and

passively accepting the world around them. "This picture vividly contrasts with the prevalent notion of restless youth eager to explore and experiment." The 18-year-old, however, must be seen against a background of war and threat of war, anxiety and confusion in moral standards. — W. W. Charters, Jr.

Here is an old technique used to punctuate present day problems.

5817. LINDBERG, JOHN. (Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton, N. J.) FOUNDATIONS OF SOCIAL SURVIVAL. New York: Columbia University Press, 1953, viii, 260 p. \$3.50. — Two abstract cities are presented to explain two social theories. One city represents reason; the other, Christian theory. Production, defense, reproduction and order are compared under the two systems postulated. The author concludes that reason is not enough. Love is necessary for the dynamism needed for social organizations to grow without violent revolutions; "meanwhile, there remains Christendom's grave danger: that of considering churches, states, and even civilizations, not as expendable means, but as ends in themselves." — G. K. Morlan.

Recent legislation makes prejudice studies more important.

5887. MARSH, JOSEPH E., & SMITH, MADORA E. (603 West White St., Champaign, Ill.) JUDGMENT OF PREJUDICE BEFORE, DURING, AND AFTER WORLD WAR II. *J. soc. Psychol.*, 1953, 38, 31-37. — "This study . . . is a repetition of studies made of student populations at the Univ. of Hawaii in 1938 and 1942 in which 20 racial and national groups were ranked according to the degree of liking for or prejudice against them that the raters considered the average white American felt." From the results, "ratings of 1950 are more similar to those of 1938 than they are to the ratings of 1942" which were affected by the war, and "some evidence of projection is shown in that students apparently ranked the 20 peoples according to their own prejudices rather than according to their interpretation of the opinion of the average white American." — J. C. Franklin.

5894. ROSE, ARNOLD M., ATELSEK, FRANK J., & McDONALD, LAWRENCE R. (U. Minnesota, Minneapolis) NEIGHBORHOOD REACTIONS TO ISOLATED NEGRO RESIDENTS: AN ALTERNATIVE TO INVASION AND SUCCESSION. *Amer. sociol. Rev.*, 1953, 18, 497-507. — Interviews with white Minneapolis residents living in neighborhoods in which also live one or two Negro families suggested "there is a tendency to accept or to accommodate to the Negro as a neighbor." Among other findings, the interviews showed that whites who live close to the Negro families have more contact with them and are more favorable to them and to interracial association generally than those who live farther away, especially in neighborhoods where the Negro family has resided for ten years or more. Families with school age children are more favorable to interracial association than are families with younger children. — W. W. Charters, Jr.

A Completely NEW Teaching Tool

THE INTERNATIONAL LESSON

ANNUAL--1956

— CHARLES M. LAYMON, Editor —

This is the book that teachers of adult classes have hoped for — to give them the latest and most reliable information and materials, to help them teach lessons that people remember and live by. Multiple authorship brings together the best in scholars and writers of many denominations.

This is the first of a series of Sunday school lesson helps destined to become among lesson commentaries what *The Interpreter's Bible* has become among Bible commentaries. Included are many unique features found in no other commentary.

For all the International Sunday School Lessons in 1956, these specific helps:

TEXT: The complete texts of the lessons in the King James and the Revised Standard versions, printed in parallel columns for easy comparison.

EXPLANATION: "Exploring the Bible Text." Outstanding scholars — each an expert in his field — explain special meaning in the Bible passages not readily gained from the text alone.

APPLICATION: "Looking at the Lesson Today." Roy L. Smith, well-known author of many religious books, makes a penetrating, highly readable analysis of what the Bible text means in terms of our life today.

TEACHING SUGGESTIONS: "Teaching the Lesson in Class." Step-by-step suggestions, by outstanding preachers, for making the message of the lesson clear to the class.

ADDITIONAL UNIQUE FEATURES

Unit Organization * Audio-visual Resources * Articles on Special Days
Annotated Daily Bible Readings

Here is the answer to a long-felt need — the very best in scholarship and interpretation — the latest and most reliable information and materials — to help the teacher present an informed, inspiring lesson.

THE CONTRIBUTORS

Charles M. Laymon, Roy L. Smith, Theodore P. Ferris, Floyd V. Filson, Mary M. Harrison, Gerald B. Harvey, Francis E. Kearns, Lindsey P. Pherigo, Chester W. Quimby, Martin Rist, Ralph W. Sockman, Dwight E. Stevenson, J. Carter Swaim, Howard E. Tower, Kyle M. Yates.

Get your copy at your favorite bookstore

ABINGDON PRESS

448 large pages

size 6 x 9 ONLY \$2.95

BOOK REVIEWS

Working With Juniors at Church, By DOROTHY LACROIX. New York: Abingdon Press, 1955. 160 pages. \$2.00.

Throughout this second series leadership text the reader is constantly conscious of boys and girls busily at work, learning as they work. At the beginning of the book, the author points out that learning is closely linked with experience; it means having something happen to you that changes you in some way and to some degree. The remainder of the book shows how the teacher or other leader can guide such learning. It points out the importance of a purpose, and of a better understanding of our lesson materials and of our pupils. There are chapters on planning for a unit, and on guiding pupils in active ways of learning as the unit progresses.

Organizational matters are dealt with in the book, also. One chapter deals with the importance of teachers planning together, and another chapter is concerned with grading and grouping, a place for learning, the best use of time in a session, and suggestions for overcrowded situations. Yet another chapter discusses an effective church program for juniors in terms of the kinds of activities through which they best learn, and the various kinds of sessions which may be held for them not only on Sunday but also throughout the week. A final chapter contains helpful ideas for enlisting parents as fellow teachers of religion. Throughout the book are many illustrations from actual work with boys and girls. — *Blanche Hoke*, Editor, Junior Materials, The Board of Education and Publication of the American Baptist Convention, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

Do You Understand the Bible? By J. CARTER SWAIM. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1954. 173 pages. \$2.50.

Readers of the author's *Right and Wrong Ways To Use the Bible* will be eager to see what he has done in this volume. It is said to be a sequel with the purpose of developing more fully those "right ways" of using the Bible. More specifically Doctor Swaim aims, he says, "to point out a number of ways in which our thought forms and presuppositions differ from those which we meet in the Scripture . . . Chapters I through V deal with specific differences in outlook between the biblical world and our own: VI through X suggest how these differences are illustrated in the unfolding of some of the foremost themes of the Bible.

A reviewer is under obligation to describe a book and evaluate it. Here a description may nullify to some extent the evaluation which is quite high despite some disappointment. The general pattern of the chapters is a grouping of numerous Scripture passages, cited within a running stream of striking "illustrations". Everywhere there is a glow of insight as to the meaning of the Scripture.

One supposes that certain preachers and teachers will find this a gold mine. Another type of mind will wish that everything were more carefully organized around clearly stated principles.

Yet every reader will lay down the volume with new appreciation of the Bible's richness and its relevance to the ongoing life of active Christian love. It will be also a reference work often consulted if one takes the time to build an index to the passages it cited. — *Ralph D. Heim*, Professor of Christian Education and English Bible, Lutheran Theological Seminary, Gettysburg, Pennsylvania.

Two Seasons: Advent and Lent. By KENDIG B. CULLY and IRIS V. CULLY. Indianapolis: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, 1954. 159 pages. \$1.75.

This book contains devotional materials for each day in Advent and in Lent (including Sundays and Easter). They follow the customary form: for each day a brief quotation from the Bible, a meditation and a prayer. One feature is original as far as we know: the page facing the meditation is left blank for the user's individual notes.

It is said that the Cullys used these meditations in their own home. That may lead to the conclusion that we have here something for families with children. Consider, though, this sentence: "Interpersonal relationships often get out of equilibrium." The outlook is characterized by maturity of religious insight, feeling, and purpose. This emphasis, plus the limitation to the two great seasons and the blank page idea, are the features for consideration by potential users. — *Ralph D. Heim*, Professor of Christian Education and English Bible, Lutheran Theological Seminary, Gettysburg, Pennsylvania.

The Sacraments in the Christian Life. By M. M. PHILIPON, O. P., translated by Rev. John Otto, Ph. D. Westminster: Newman Press, 1954. xvi + 394 pages. \$4.25.

Any man seriously intent on reaching heaven will realize that the beatific life is not his by any native right. The human makeup does not include the equipment that man needs to see God face to face and to derive from this vision the perfect satisfaction of glory. For this, man needs not just a new vitality or a lift in energy, but a new kind of life that will be the principle of activity that is natural only to the Divine Persons. This new life does not destroy his purely human life, nor does it smother his natural functions: it is engrafted on his very being, changing him, not chemically but truly, dignifying him and giving a new, family-kind of relationship to his Creator. This is a real life, capable of growth, liable to death. It reaches perfection only in heaven, but is man's most precious possession during his life on earth. It can come to man only by way of gift: he receives it from God through the mediation of Jesus Christ. This is the Christian life of which Father Philipon writes.

Deploring the attitude that holiness and the striving for it are reserved to those who live in convents and monasteries, he insists on the responsibility of every person to develop and perfect his supernatural life. His book is a detailed explanation

tion of how that development takes place: he describes the activity of God in the soul through the instrumentality of the sacraments and explains what the voluntary reaction of man should be. He is not concerned about the apologetical aspects of Sacramental Theology, but concentrates almost exclusively on a positive exposition of what the sacraments can do for a well intentioned man. It might be called a Spiritual Theology of the sacraments.

Man is born into the supernatural life and receives the faculties of the supernatural organism through Baptism. Confirmation, "our Pentecost," matures him in this life, giving him the status of a soldier-apostle. Nourishment for it is provided in the Holy Eucharist, the Body and Blood of Christ. Penance restores the sinner to life and to God after the death of serious sin. Extreme Unction fortifies man supernaturally when he is close to the end of his natural life. Matrimony makes the union of man and woman a positively holy one and causes their supernatural life to grow. Mediators between God and man are segregated and equipped to be the ministers of the mysteries of God by means of Holy Orders.

This explanation of the role of the sacraments in the supernatural life of the Christian implies, of course, belief in their divine origin and an appreciation of the social character of the supernatural life. About the latter Father Philipon is very emphatic. Baptism is described as incorporation in Christ, Penance as the forgiveness of Christ, Matrimony as family life in Christ. He points out that when Extreme Unction is administered, the whole Church is at prayer for the dying person and that the priest, in his ministrations, acts in the person of Christ and in the name of the whole Church.

Father Philipon is a theologian of the first rank and his mastery of a very complex subject is impressively complete. His explanations of doctrine are worked out methodically and are always clear. Despite these virtues the book is not always easy reading with its lengthy chapters and frequently ponderous style. These will give some trouble, perhaps, but they are more than compensated for by the orderly presentation of some very important material.—*William F. Hogan*, Immaculate Conception Seminary, Darlington, New Jersey.



Book of Kings I. By LEO L. HONOR. ("The Jewish Commentary for Bible Readers.") New York: Union of American Hebrew Congregations, 1955. 367 pages. \$4.75.

This is the third in a series of popular Jewish commentaries (see Solomon B. Freehof, *The Psalms*, and Israel Bettan, *The Five Scrolls*). The needs of the teacher in the religious school have been kept in mind. Although written more immediately for the Jewish teacher, this and the other published books of the series should be of value not only in Jewish but in Christian religious education. The reviewer would recommend this book highly for the church school library.

Dr. Honor has made effective use of contemporary scholarship, and himself makes a contribution to that scholarship. His commentary includes also references to rabbinic homilies based on the verses of I Kings. The introduction to the book presents

the reader with discussions of the ethical and religious (prophetic) purposes of Kings, various theories regarding authorship and date, the sources, the work of the main author, light thrown on Kings by archaeology, and the value of Kings to the modern reader. Professor Honor is conversant with the significant archaeological materials and the relevant data from the general Near East.

The commentary is sufficiently detailed to provide consideration of the important historical problems involved, and to note the religious import. The author's familiarity with the literature on his subject is evidenced not only in his comments but also in the nearly thirty pages of notes appended at the end of the volume and in the bibliography in the Key to References. He is obviously acquainted with the textual and linguistic problems involved, although the purpose of the book properly limits the treatment of these. With its fine combination of scholarly and religious aspects, this book should find a welcome reception. A brief "Editor's Introduction" is provided by Emanuel Gamoran, editor of the commentary series.—*Herber G. May*, Professor of Old Testament Language and Literature, Graduate School of Theology, Oberlin College, Oberlin, Ohio.



Mennonite Life. JOHN A. HOSTETLER. Scottdale, Pa.; Mennonite Publishing House, 1954. 31 pages. \$0.50.

This booklet is a welcome account of the faith, practices and customs of the Mennonites, a better knowledge of whom is desirable and likely to prove intellectually and morally profitable. The author is a practical sociologist, and he has had close and friendly contact with the groups he introduces to the lay public interested in the rich religious life of the American people.

The total number of Mennonites in North America is 250,000. They are divided into several sects, but all adhere to the simple and uncompromising belief that salvation, in the Christian sense of the term, requires much more than a profession of faith, however sincere it be. One must live according to the commandments of Jesus—one must "obey" him, literally. The great majority of so-called Christians are of course fundamentally un- or anti-Christian in the Mennonite view.

How the true, authentic Christian should live and work in the world we know, and how the Mennonites themselves translate their sentiments into their own daily behavior, are questions the average lay readers will inevitably ask, and the answers will be found in the booklet under notice. Many will be thankful to the authors and publishers for the information.—*Victor S. Yanos*, La Jolla, California.



Within the Chancel. THOMAS A. STAFFORD. Abingdon Press, New York and Nashville, Tennessee, 1955. 92 pages. \$2.00.

In keeping with the trend in American Protestantism toward more beautiful, worshipful and churchly church buildings, Dr. Stafford offers a clear, succinct and persuasive explanation of why and how changes in church structure and fittings should be made. Noting a tendency toward over-

ornamentation, he pleads for intelligent moderation. Nevertheless he firmly takes a stand in the *Foreword* for "the belief that the divided type of chancel, with a central altar or Communion table, contributes to reverent worship in the house of God." That Dr. Stafford, who is a Methodist, considers such a belief to be "moderation" is revealing of how far the movement toward a more liturgical arrangement of the churches has gone, even among bodies which do not use a formal liturgy.

Dr. Stafford hopes "that this book will serve as a simple guide to ministers and church members who are concerned to make and keep the chancel of the church a worthy center for worship of God." He has done everything that could be expected of him to make this book fulfill that hope.

Twelve crisp, precise and wholly unpolemic chapters treat such subjects as "Beauty in God's House" (American free-church architecture in the past half century); "Worship and Architecture" (from early Christian days to post-reformation puritanism to the present day); "The Chancel"; "The Altar"; "Symbolic Lights"; "Monograms and Symbols"; "Stained Glass"; "Flags"; "Flowers"; "Vestments"; "Seasons and Colors"; and "Altar Guild."

At the close of the text there are valuable tools provided in the form of a glossary, a bibliography, and an index. The author does not hesitate to list terms such as antependium, cassock, cotta, dossal, fair linen, gradin, mensa, paraments, prie-dieu, redos and surplice, terms which certainly have not been in use in free church worship vocabularies for many a year. The bibliography includes authors from at least a half-dozen denominations with the so-called liturgical denominations, i. e. the Episcopal and Lutheran, in the minority.

The book is enriched with twelve pictures of beautiful, liturgically arranged churches representing Presbyterian, Episcopal, Methodist, interdenominational, Lutheran, Baptist, Congregational-Christian and Evangelical United Brethren groups reaching geographically from Quincy, Massachusetts to Kansas City, Missouri. In addition the author has made use of numerous line drawings to illustrate words, ideas, and descriptions.

Within the Chancel will be of great worth to ministers, church building committees, lay worship leaders planning worship centers for Sunday Schools and similar individuals and groups. With moderation and clarity it can help those who are truly anxious to beautify and enhance worship. — *Richard C. Wolf*, Associate Professor of Church History, Graduate School of Theology, Oberlin College, Oberlin, Ohio.



What Did the World Council Say to You? By HAROLD A. BOSLEY, New York: Abingdon Press. 1955. 127 pages. \$2.00.

The Evanston Assembly of the World Council of Churches came and went making a large impression upon American churches and church people. All the devices of modern communication helped to make clear that an important event was taking place. The religious press reported the detail. In thousands of American pulpits sermons were preached about the meaning of the Council, the Assembly, and its documents.

The minister of the First Methodist Church in



● by Ernest Marshall Howse

Eight masterpieces of the theater — *Hamlet, Othello, Macbeth, King Lear, Richard III, Julius Caesar, The Merchant of Venice, The Tempest* — are explored in light of the universal moral problems they dramatize. Here are revealing answers to the question, What can Shakespeare tell us about man and his relation to God?

An ideal book for collateral reading — for those who give week-night talks and lead student discussions. **\$2.50**

HOW TO START COUNSELING

● by William E. Hulme

This book brings practical help in fitting counseling knowledge and ability into a framework of definite action. Here are answers to such real problems as: how to get people to come to you for guidance, and how to organize a counseling program.

For all those who seek to aid others in the living of their lives, here is a guidebook to help in *getting started*. **\$2.50**

AT ALL BOOKSTORES



Abingdon Press

Evanston decided to preach not one sermon, but a series of sermons dealing not with the external aspects of the Assembly, but with the contents of its reports. Dr. Bosley was peculiarly well equipped for this endeavor because his church was the "host church" for the Assembly, and because of his own competence as a philosopher of religion and a leader in the social concerns of the churches.

Six of the eight chapters are based on the Section reports. In all eight, Dr. Bosley comes swiftly to the essential core of the documents interpreting them in language understandable to any layman willing to read or listen. These chapters are good reporting. They are good preaching. They have the further value of providing valuable insights and commentary from one of America's great pulpits. — *Gerald E. Knoff*, Executive Secretary, Division of Christian Education, National Council of Churches of Christ in the U. S. A., New York City.



The Catholic Shrines of Europe. By JOHN K. CARTWRIGHT. With photographs by ALFRED WAGG. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company. 1955. 212 pages. \$6.00.

The first question to ask about a volume which is essentially a pictorial record is whether the photographic reproduction is well done. The book's importance is not assured thereby, but things are off to a good start. In this case an affirmative response is in order. Film director and cameraman Wagg has either taken or assembled some 250 black-and-white prints and eight full-page color photos. His exteriors and his detail work are flawless; an occasional late medieval or baroque church interior strikes the viewer as insipid, but this may merely be a tribute to the fidelity of his lens. The color work is especially good, and a tasteful binding and map complete the appeal to the sense of vision. In the light of today's production costs, the book's somewhat forbidding price does not seem excessive.

Whatever advantage might have been gained by the wedded skills of photographer and book producer could easily have been forfeited by a questionable pattern of selection or an inept commentary. Happily this is far from the case, since the publisher had the good sense to seek out a compiler who handles language gracefully and is at the same time at home with the materials of history. Monsignor Cartwright, Rector of St. Matthew's Cathedral in the national capital, has done the extensive and intelligent travel necessary to this book while holding chairs in ecclesiastical history at Mount St. Mary's Seminary, Emmitsburg, Md., and the Catholic University of America, Washington. It becomes evident as one progresses through the rather ample text what an ambitious work of historical survey has been attempted. The author maintains good balance throughout: detailed information yet without the distractions of extended historical criticism; literary allusion that never takes on the aspect of the purple patch; and above all a reporter's directness even when describing matters over which passions have run (and do run) high. There is no intended parochialism of view in the sites selected. History itself is largely the editor (thus for example, the exclusion of the modernly inaccessible Slav,

Magyar and Baltic nations), and in cases where whole treasure houses of Christian art and prayer have changed hands the purpose of the book dictates the principle: "... we have limited ourselves to shrines which are in Catholic hands or that are still frequented by Catholics who come to them not merely as tourists but as pilgrims impelled by devotion." (p.203)

The prospective traveler has safe guides in Monsignor Cartwright and Mr. Wagg. Armchair reminiscers will congratulate the pair for their freshness of view. For while all the proper pieties are attended to, there is just enough element of shared discovery in these pages to insure praise for the author's discernment, and perhaps a recollection in the reader of a September day on the Rock of Cashel, a morning in Luxembourg when one had to be a photographer to get into the cathedral for the royal wedding. — *Gerald S. Sloyan*, The Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C.



The Jews in America: A History. By RUFUS LEARSI [pseud.] New York: World Publishing Company, 1954. 382 pages. \$6.00.

Rufus Lears, author of a number of books on Jewish history, has recently published a book *The Jews of America* written in commemoration of the tercentenary of the settlement of the Jews in the United States. In it the author attempts to give a survey of Jewish life in this country as it developed in the course of the three centuries and to evaluate the contributions of the Jews to the welfare and progress of this land. Going back to Colonial times, Mr. Lears depicts the struggle of the early Jewish settlers for equal rights. Although trials and tribulations were great, their perseverance and determination to strike root in the soil to which they were transplanted helped them win equal rights for themselves. As faithful and true American they gave of themselves and of their wealth toward the upbuilding of this country. We read of the leading Jews who attained prominence in political and civic life and of those who won fame for their contributions to the cultural life of the United States.

The author is not content, however, with merely glorifying Jewish contributions to America. His main intention is to give an explicit picture of the rise and development of the American Jewish community. Jews from all corners of the world came here to find a haven from persecution and oppression. Despite the social cleavage which existed between the various elements of the larger Jewish community, the Jews succeeded in establishing religious, cultural and philanthropic institutions. They made it possible for American Jewry "to play a signal role for the weal and the future of the Jewish people as a whole." The author gives due place to the variety of ideologies — religious, cultural and political. He does that to point out that differences in opinions or points of view do not hamper the growth of a community, but help mould it and give it a definite character. The author concludes the book with the following significant statement: "No other Jewish aggregation had in so short a time become so thoroughly interwoven with the institutions, culture and spirit of the nation of which it formed a part. It responded eagerly to the opportunities which, not-

withstanding rebuffs and hostility in some quarters, democratic America held out to them."

The book is intended for popular consumption and is, therefore, written in a popular style. It is not a product of scholarly research. One striking short-coming should be pointed out. In relating the history and development of various movements the author devotes too much space and gives undue emphasis to their European backgrounds. As a whole, however, the book is a worthwhile contribution to popular Jewish Americana. — *Leo Shpall*, Brooklyn Jewish Center, Brooklyn, New York.



Modern Science and God. By P. J. McLAUGHLIN. New York: Philosophical Library. 1954. 89 pages. \$2.75.

This overpriced volume consists of the 1951 Papal address to the Pontifical Academy of Science, with Dr. McLaughlin's commentaries. The address, one of Pius XII's recent major pronouncements on matters concerning science and religion, deals mostly with the proofs of the existence of God from change in the universe. He points out that modern science has added tremendously to the substratum of facts needed for such proofs and thus clarified considerably the Christian world-view. Scientific estimates of the age of the universe receive much attention. In our opinion, the significance of these estimates is not necessarily as great as address (and commentary) imply. Science gives the age of the present physical regime in the universe. It cannot indicate what may physically have preceded the present regime.

Not technically detailed, the address gives general guidance and creates a helpful atmosphere for such discussion, helping those seeking to clarify the relation between religion and science.

Dr. McLaughlin's commentary attempts to provide the background for general readers. In his informal manner he glosses over some serious scientific and philosophical problems: the recent well publicized physical "continuous creation" theories are dismissed as "gratuitous", when one might say they still suffer from some purely scientific defects and perhaps conflict with scientific evidence. — *Charles M. Herzfeld*, Silver Spring, Md.



The Christian Imprint. By FRED PIERCE CORSON. New York: Abingdon Press. 1955. 156 pages. \$2.50.

This timely evaluation of modern Christian education by Bishop Corson is a very stimulating and incisive work. Its theme centers around the idea that life is making an imprint on each person and it is the object of Christian education to make that imprint Christian.

In words well chosen to awaken leaders in this field to a renewed sense of responsibility, the author makes many salient points among which are the following: The basic requirement for teachers is the proper philosophy of life. When education is viewed as an end rather than a means, it will always be disappointing. The goal of Christian education should always be a person who is mature in Christ.

This book has the limitation of presenting many stimulating ideas but few means of implementing

them. The author also makes the common error of emphasizing the importance of definiteness in identifying the characteristics of Christian maturity and then launching into a traditional theological discussion of them using vague and general terms.

The strengths of this book far outweigh its weaknesses, and it ought to be a must on the reading list of parents, teachers, ministers, and all others who are interested in or responsible for Christian education. — *Denton R. Coker*, Assistant Professor of Religious Education, Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary, Wake Forest, North Carolina.



Making Religion Real. By NELS F. S. FERRE. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1955. 157 pages. \$2.00.

Here is a book in which a man who has lived and thought deeply invites the reader to walk with him through the sanctuary of his soul. He says in the preface, "I know that there is an adequate faith and that it is generally available. I want you the reader to see that what I write here is no theory about religion, but a personal experience of reality." It is impossible to read this book and not feel the power of this conviction.

In eight chapters Ferre speaks of making religion real through thinking, reading, prayer, worship, family, friendship, giving and suffering. In each instance the writer stands within his subject and speaks out of personal experience, yet always avoiding the intimacy that breeds contempt. But the book is far more than a personal testimony, for the writer is a notable philosopher and theologian whose reflections upon experience are wise and penetrating. Indeed it is this combination of deep religious feeling with profound learning that gives the book the richness and balance absent in much devotional literature.

Today when an increasing number of intelligent people are wistfully seeking guidance in finding their way into the religious life, this book comes as a boon to the pastor who may desire to recommend a book that is free from technical jargon without being superficial. However, its value is not limited to laymen. All religious workers will find inspiration in this searching study of the religious life.

Pastoral counselors will regret that an incidental reference to client-centered counseling on page 147 should be a caricature. This minor blemish may be overlooked, however, for it lies outside the main concern of the book.

Many uses could be suggested for the book. Among others it would be an ideal study book for mid-week services or adult classes. — *Wayne K. Clymer*, Department of Practical Theology, Evangelical Theological Seminary, Naperville, Illinois.



The Churches and the Schools; American Protestantism and Popular Elementary Education. By FRANCIS X. CURRAN, S.J. Chicago: Loyola University Press. 1954. 130 pages. \$3.00.

Most of the precise issues considered here were well joined, if not entirely resolved, before the turn of the century. But in church schools and public schools we are jousting still with differences over religion and distribution of tax moneys, lack

of trained teachers and lack of funds — and even those who have abandoned the lists are not beyond the fray.

Father Curran devotes six of eight chapters to a factual examination of the causes of "the surrender by American Protestantism of the control of popular elementary education to the states," tracing the vicissitude of popular elementary education among Episcopalians, Congregationalists, Reformed Churches, Quakers, Methodists, and Baptists. (The summation takes into account also the experiences of Presbyterians and Lutherans, as individually examined by other authors). In the last chapter he offers what appears to this reviewer to be a dispassionate and objective analysis of the facts adduced.

Perhaps the simplest way of indicating the painstaking character of the author's research is to say that the final chapter seems almost superfluous. This is a clear picture, well worth the attention of the thoughtful student of our present difficulties with education in particular and secularism in general.

It is perhaps unfair to quarrel with the term "control", which is used throughout. Nor is there any reason to challenge the statement that organizations of parents or private educational institutions cannot hope to supply universal elementary education, which "must perforce be imparted by the church or by the state, working singly or together." Yet, without being facetious, the author lists one of the causes of the decline of Protestant elementary education as "a lack of pupils." This emphasizes that the real control of elementary education resides in parents, who have the ultimate responsibility of providing it for their children. More strictly speaking, it would seem that what has been surrendered — given our present constitutional circumstances — is the privilege of imparting elementary education, rather than the right to control it. — Arthur B. Focke, Washington, D. C.



The Doctrine of Election in Tannaitic Literature.
By BENJAMIN W. HELFGOTT. New York:
King's Crown Press, 1954. 209 pages. \$3.50.

This is a scholarly, well-documented volume, in which the author shows how the rabbis defended the election of Israel as the chosen people. After reviewing the Christian challenge of Israel as the chosen people seen through Paul's Letter to the Romans, the Epistle of Barnabas, and the Dialogue of Justin Martyr with Trypho, the author reviews the reaction of rabbis at the time of the destruction of the Temple in 70 (Rabban Jochanan ben Zaccai), among the teachers of Jabneh (rabbis Gamaliel II, Eliezer ben Hyrcanus, Joshua ben Hananiah), at the time of the Bar Kochba revolt (rabbis Akiba and Ishmael), at the reconstruction at Usha (rabbis Meir, Simeon ben Yohai, Jose ben Halaftha, and Judah ben Ilai), and in the writings of Judah Hanasi in the Mishnah. He concludes that usually the greater the teacher's stress on universalism, the deeper his view of Israel's election; though not all Tannaists were universalists. The rabbis did not see God's election as arbitrary; the Jewish people with their freedom played a role in the election. After the period of Hadrian, when

the Nazarenes were completely separated from the body of Judaism, the animosity of the Jews toward Christians was lessened, since no longer were the Jews afraid that the Christian attitude toward their own election might infest the synagogue. Nor did the rabbis find validity in the scriptural proofs of Israel's rejection. God's call of Israel could be found in the Torah and God's love for mankind; the destruction of the Temple in 70 showed that Israel's national and religious existence as a particular people did not depend upon the state and the sanctuary.

For those interested in a specialized study of this type, this book will prove very interesting and convincing. However, the book, though clearly written and well-documented, is one which will be appreciated more by the scholar and the teacher than by the average reader of religious books. — Thomas S. Kepler, Professor of New Testament, Graduate School of Theology, Oberlin College, Oberlin, Ohio.

BOOK NOTES

Followers of the Way. By CARL J. SCHERZER.
Philadelphia: The Christian Education Press,
1955. 120 pages. \$1.75.

The subtitle for this helpful book of devotional readings is aptly described "meditations for youth and adults." This volume contains 68 devotional readings of about 400 words each, 32 of which are related to biblical personalities. The selections are related to the Christian year: The Changing Year, The Epiphany Season, Lent and Easter, Easter to Pentecost, The Trinity Season, Advent and Christmas. Each devotional reading is preceded by a short scriptural reading, most of them of several lines from the New Testament. The excerpts are clearly written, focused in a devotional touch, so that the readers may find something in each selection which may inspire them to become better "followers of the way." Each pattern has spiritual value to help one start the day with a worthwhile meditation. — Thomas S. Kepler, Professor of New Testament, Graduate School of Theology, Oberlin College.



Wisdom of Life from the Bible. Compiled by
J. M. ADISON. Boston: House of Edinboro,
1954. 123 pages. \$2.00.

This book is a compilation of wise sayings and apophthegms taken from the Bible and arranged alphabetically by subject. The author's intention is neither theological nor creedal, but practical. What he presents is practical wisdom to be followed as daily situations may demand.

Of the thirteen hundred quotations, 570 come from the Book of Proverbs and from the uncanonical Book of Ecclesiasticus, 480 from the rest of the Old Testament, and 265 from the New Testament.

A general idea of the nature of the four hundred subjects may be obtained from a list of a few taken at random, one from under each letter of the alphabet: anger, balm, composure, deceit, errors, flattery, glory, haste, inferiority complex,

joy, kindness, laughter, meat-eating, neighbor, oppression, peace, questions, righteousness, silence, toast-master, ups-and-downs, versatility, wages, youth, Zion.

The author, who had studied to be a rabbi, hopes that this handy compendium will inspire, comfort, guide and offer stimulating thought to the reader. It is doubtful, however, if reading such detached passages, completely out of context, will inspire any one to go to the Bible for guidance from it for daily life. The book will probably be found helpful to preachers and public speakers who can find in it easily available and neatly classified Biblical quotations with which to enhance the effect of their words. — *George P. Michaelides*, Director of Schauffler Division of Christian Education, graduate School of Theology, Oberlin College, Oberlin, Ohio.



The Life and Teachings of Jesus. By CHARLES M. LAYMON. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1955. 336 pages. \$3.00.

The author of this book taught studies in the Bible at Scarritt College from 1943 to 1950, and is now editor of adult publications in the Board of Education of the Methodist Church. This book is not only the result of his own teaching experience, but has been somewhat shaped after his consultation with college teachers of the Bible. The book's organization is traditional: after four chapters on the background for the study of Jesus' life and teachings, the author devotes twenty-two chapters to Jesus' life events from the birth to the resurrection, with essential chapters interspersed which deal with topics like the miracles, the Kingdom of God, prayer, wealth, God, and Jesus as Lord. At the end of each chapter is a list of provocative questions for discussion, and a list of readings for the student to pursue. The style of the book is very readable; the author has delineated his ideas succinctly; the organization is clear; the viewpoint of the author is constructive and open to investigate the problems of criticism as he meets them. For college students and adult classes, who wish a beginning class on Jesus, this book is very well fitted. For those who wish to penetrate more deeply into biblical problems, the suggested bibliography will guide them farther. I wish that the author might have devoted an entire chapter to the Sermon on the Mount, and that in some instances he might have dealt more ruggedly with biblical problems. But this is a very good volume for the average college student and adult student of the Gospels. It should be both edifying and helpful. — *Thomas S. Kepler*, Professor of New Testament, Graduate School of Theology, Oberlin College, Oberlin, Ohio.



A Diary of Reading. By JOHN BAILLIE. New York: Charles Scribners' Sons, 1955. 385 pages. \$2.50.

Those who are familiar with the writings of John Baillie, especially his *Diary of Private Prayer*, will approach his new book of readings with keen anticipation. During his years of research Dr. Baillie has culled those passages which have inspired him and which speak of personal religious living and thought. Poets, philosophers, theologians and essayists all speak through these pages with profound insight.

Dr. Baillie must have had Baron Von Hugel in mind when he collected these passages. Von Hugel, who is quoted several times, says that a quarter hour of meditative reading each day "for now forty years or more, I am sure has been one of the greatest sustanances and sources of calm for my life." This book is designed to prepare the reader for just this kind of adventure.

Although the format of the book provides a page for each day, this is not just another book of "daily devotions", and is not likely to prove popular as a family devotional book. In fact, not everyone who was immediately attracted to Dr. Baillie's prayers will find this book of interest. But for the searching soul who is willing to ponder the issues of life, this book will give food for thought each day of the year. It is rich in sentiment, but free from sentimentality. — *Wayne K. Clymer*, Professor of Practical Theology, Evangelical Theological Seminary, Naperville, Illinois.



Iggeret Teman (Letter to the Jews of Yemen). By MAIMONIDES. Edited by SOLOMON GOLDMAN. New York: Histadruth Ivrit of America, 1950. 205 pages.

This is Vol. 6 in the series of annotated texts of Hebrew classics, published with notes and vocabulary to help make the Hebrew literature accessible and attractive to students. Dr. Goldman has here made free use of existing Hebrew translations of Maimonides' *Letter*, which was originally written in Arabic. The presentation of the Hebrew text is preceded by a brief outline of the line of Maimonides and the occasion for the *Letter*, as well as a synopsis of the *Letter*. — *Herbert G. May*, Professor of Old Testament Language and Literature, Graduate School of Theology, Oberlin College, Oberlin, Ohio.



The World's Religions. By CHARLES S. BRADEN. Rev. ed. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1954. 256 pages. \$3.00.

This book was first published in 1939. The present edition has revised the statistical tables and brought some new insights to bear on a few areas such as the Japanese development. In addition a new chapter has been included entitled "The Religions of Ancient America."

Along with these improvements and additions the book preserves the values that marked the earlier edition. It is written in a non-technical style and is comprehensible to the intelligent layman. Moreover, it manages to compress a significant amount of material into a relatively few pages without seriously distorting the total portrait of the religions discussed. Also it includes convenient summaries of essential principles which can be an aid to comprehension provided they do not become substitutes for contextual study. The bibliography has been brought up to date. This revision will give the book a greater usefulness as an introductory account of an important part of the human story. — *J. William Lee*, Assistant Professor of Philosophy of Religion, Graduate School of Theology, Oberlin College, Oberlin, Ohio.

The Book of Daniel (Harper's Annotated Bible Series, No. 12). By JULIUS A. BEWER. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1955. 37 pages. 75c.

One may take this as an opportunity to pay tribute to a great scholar and teacher, contributor of much of lasting value in many areas of Old Testament study. *The Book of Daniel* is the last of his works. He had nearly completed the final corrections on his manuscript before his death, and Dr. Emil Kraeling has given it the necessary final touches and seen it through the final stages of proof. Along with Professor F. C. Grant's annotation of the New Testament books in this series, Professor Bewer's careful exegesis has made this one of the best of the recent annotated Bibles. — *Herbert C. May*, Professor of Old Testament Language and Literature, Graduate School of Theology, Oberlin College, Oberlin, Ohio.



The Catholicity of Protestantism. Edited by R. Newton Flew and Rupert E. Davies. Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1954. 159 pages. \$1.75.

This book is a vigorous and competent affirmation of the catholic nature and classic Protestant faith.

The Protestant doctrine of creation and of the fall of man is soundly scriptural and historically catholic. Luther's "Theology of the Natural" surpassed scholastic Natural Theology. Justification and sanctification do not depend upon any single system of episcopacy and sacramental thought. Classic Protestant thought emphasizes the doctrinal nature of the Church quite as much as the Catholic tradition. The Protestant ministry is as truly an apostolic ministry as are episcopal ministries. In the Protestant Lord's Supper, the Real Presence is as certainly found as in the Anglican Eucharist and in the Roman Mass.

Protestants, therefore, may say with their Catholic (Roman, Anglican, Orthodox or other) brethren, "I believe in the one holy catholic and apostolic church and add with right and reason" . . . and I am a member (minister) of it!"

Franklin Clark Fry contributes a preface, the Archbishop of Canterbury, a foreword — *Gerald E. Knoff*, Ex. Secretary, Division of Christian Education, National Council of Churches of Christ, New York City.



The King James Version; The New Testament in Cadenced Form. Designed by Morton C. Bradley, Jr. New York: Rinehart & Company, 1954. 683 pages. \$5.00.

Here is a beautifully printed and bound volume of the New Testament in the King James Version. Its special characteristic is its cadenced form — a printing arrangement that brings out clearly through indentation, spacing and variety of type, subdivisions like paragraphs, groups of sentences, individual sentences and quotations. This makes for better reading and for better topical comprehension. The volume will doubtless be found valuable not only for personal study of the New Testament but more so for public reading.

Neither chapters nor verses are noted in the text. This too makes for easier reading although it does create difficulties in locating certain pass-

ages. However, the approximate location can be found by consulting the figures on every page. — *George P. Michaelides*, Director of Schauffler Division of Christian Education, Graduate School of Theology, Oberlin College, Oberlin, Ohio.



Forgotten Founding Fathers of the American Church and State. By William T. Hanzsche. Boston: Christopher Publishing House, 1954. 209 pages. \$3.00.

Ask the average educated American to name "the Founding Fathers" and he will surely give you Washington, Jefferson, Franklin and Adams. Some will remember Madison. "The rest is silence." Here is a valuable, scholarly and much-needed book on other and older founders of our basic institutions and earnest, enlightened interpreters of original Americanism.

Schools, colleges, libraries, public and private, will doubtless acquire the volume and recommend it to their charges or patrons. The "forgotten founders" here presented merit honor and recognition for services less spectacular, perhaps, or revolutionary duly, than those we celebrate and appreciate.

The names of the men whose significant biographies we should remember henceforth are as follows: Francis Makemie, William Tennent, Johnathan Dickinson, David Brainard, Gilbert Tennent, Samuel Davis, John Witherspoon.

There is inspiration and liberal education in these "lives." The author, indeed, succeeds in making his seven distinguished colonial figures come alive. Incidentally, we learn little-known, early colonial history that is not without relevance and instruction for our own difficult and critical period. — *Victor S. Yarros*, La Jolla, California.



From the Sermons of Rabbi Milton Steinberg; — High Holydays and Major Festivals. Edited by Bernard Mandelbaum. New York: Bloch Publishing Company, 1954. 200 pages. \$4.50.

The late Rabbi Milton Steinberg of the Park Avenue Synagogue in New York, has made a priceless contribution to rabbis and others who plan sermons or lectures that deal with "Rosh Hassanah" (the Jewish New Year), "Yom Kippur" (the Day of Atonement), "Succas" (Feast of Thanksgiving), "Pesach" (Passover), and "Shavos" (The Feast of Weeks).

Bernard Mandelbaum who edited the book, says in his preface that the outlines and notes indicate that Rabbi Steinberg spent a great deal of time in organizing his message to insure the logical and orderly flow of his ideas as a brilliant expositor, philosopher, and novelist. His *As a Driven Leaf* had an enthusiastic reception from literary critics and the reading public in general.

The reviewer wants to call the reader's attention to the fact that his few statements are those of a layman in the field of theology and yet he derived a great satisfaction from the careful reading of the book and feels that this book by Rabbi Steinberg is one that any rabbi, minister, or layman who appears before audiences as a lecturer, will find stimulating and rewarding. — *Philip L. Seman*, University of Judaism at Los Angeles, Los Angeles, California.

RELIGIOUS EDUCATION ASSOCIATION OFFICERS

PRESIDENT — George N. Shuster, President, Hunter College, New York City.

CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD — David R. Hunter, Director, Department of Education, National Council of the Protestant Episcopal Church, Greenwich, Conn.

TREASURER — Glenn Garbutt, Management Consultant, New York City.

VICE-PRESIDENTS — Msgr. Thomas J. Quigley, Superintendent, Catholic Schools, Diocese of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pa.

Judah Pilch, Executive Director, American Association of Jewish Education, New York City.
F. Ernest Johnson, National Council of Churches, New York City.

RECORDING SECRETARY — Paul B. Maves, Professor, Drew Theological Seminary, Madison, New Jersey.

COMMITTEE ON HIGHER EDUCATION

WALTER HOUSTON CLARK, Chairman, Dean, School Religious Education, Hartford, Connecticut.

JEROME G. KERWIN, Chairman, Chicago Institute of Social and Religious Studies and Professor of Political Science, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.

JOHN M. KRUMM, Head Dept. of Religion and Chaplain Columbia University, New York City.

BERNARD LANDER, Prof. of Sociology Hunter College; Acting Director, Graduate School, Yeshiva University, New York City.

WM. F. LYNCH, Fordham University, Editor of *Thought*, New York City.

ROLAND G. SIMONITSCH, Professor of Religion, University of Notre Dame, South Bend, Indiana.

WALTER WAGONER, Exec. Secretary Rockefeller Brothers Fund for Theological Fellowships, Princeton, N. J.

COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH

RANDOLPH C. MILLER, Chairman, Divinity School of Yale University, New Haven, Conn.

PHOCAS ANGELOTOS, Secretary for Religious Education, Greek Archdiocese of America, Garrison, N. Y.

DAVID BARRY, New York City Mission Society, New York, N. Y.

DENTON R. COKER, Department of Christian Education, Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary, Wake Forest, North Carolina.

CHARLES DONAHUE, Professor of English, Fordham University, New York City.

J. FRANKLIN EWING, Fordham University, New York, N. Y.

WESNER FALLAW, Professor of Religious Education, Andover-Newton Theological Seminary.

JACOB HARTSTEIN, Dean, Graduate School, Long Island University, Brooklyn, N. Y.

FRANK HERRIOTT, Professor of Religious Education, Union Theological Seminary, New York City.

LEO L. HONOR, Professor of Education, Dropsie College for Hebrew and Cognate Learning, Philadelphia, Pa.

GORDON E. JACKSON, Professor of Philosophy and Religious Education, Pittsburgh-Xenia Theological Seminary, Pittsburgh, Penn.

OSCAR JANOWSKY, Professor, City College, New York City, also Chairman of the Commission for the Study of Jewish Education in the U. S.

JOHN E. KELLY, Assistant, National Center, Confraternity of Christian Doctrine, Washington, D. C.

ERNEST LIGON, Director, Character Research Project, Union College, Schenectady, N. Y.

RICHARD V. MCCANN, Divinity School, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.

GEORGE MICHAELIDES, Professor, Graduate School of Theology, Oberlin College, Oberlin, Ohio.

SISTER MARY JANET MILLER, S.C., Commission on American Citizenship, Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C.

SYLVAN SCHWARTZMAN, Professor of Religious Education, Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, Ohio.

HELEN SPAULDING, Associate Director of Religious Education, Dept. Research and Survey, National Council of Churches, Chicago, Ill.

RELIGIOUS EDUCATION ASSOCIATION

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS

- Phocas Angelotos — Secretary for Religious Education, Greek Archdiocese of America, Garrison, N. Y.
- David Barry — Executive Director, New York City Mission Society.
- Edna M. Baxter — Professor, School of Religious Education, Hartford, Conn.
- Josephine Bliss — Director of Religious Education, Westminster Presbyterian Church, Buffalo, N. Y.
- Thomas A. Brady — Vice-President, University of Missouri, Columbia, Mo.
- Israel S. Chipkin — Executive Vice-President, Jewish Education Committee, New York City.
- Henry H. Dennison — Manager, Employers Mutual Insurance Company, Boston, Mass. Branch.
- Earl Dimmick — Superintendent of Public Schools, Pittsburgh, Pa.
- Wesner Fallaw — Professor, Andover-Newton Theological Seminary, Newton Center, Mass.
- George B. Ford — Corpus Christi Roman Catholic Church, New York City.
- David Forsyth — Secretary, Board of Christian Education, The United Church of Canada, Toronto.
- Samuel P. Franklin — Dean Emeritus, School of Education, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pa. (Honorary).
- Solomon B. Freehof — Rabbi, Rodef Shalom Temple, Pittsburgh, Pa.
- Emanuel Gamoran — Executive Director, Commission of Jewish Education, The American Hebrew Congregations, New York City.
- Simon Greenberg — Vice-Chancellor, Jewish Theological Seminary, New York City.
- Virgil M. Hancher — President, University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa.
- Robert C. Hartnett — Editor "America," New York City.
- R. J. Henle — Dean, Graduate School, St. Louis University, St. Louis, Mo.
- S. J. Holbel — Superintendent, Catholic Schools, Buffalo, N. Y.
- Leo H. Honor — Professor, Dropsie College, Philadelphia, Pa.
- Henry Johnson — Dean and Professor of Religious Education, Scarritt College, Nashville, Tenn.
- John E. Kelly — National Center, Fraternity of Christian Doctrine, Washington, D. C.
- Jerome G. Kerwin — Chairman, Chicago Institute of Social and Religious Studies, Chicago, Ill.
- Gerald E. Knoff — Executive Secretary, Division of Christian Education, National Council of Churches of Christ, New York City.
- John Krumm — Chaplain and Chairman, Department of Religion, Columbia University, New York City.
- Hughbert H. Landram — Executive Secretary, Department of Christian Education, Church Federation of Greater Chicago, Chicago, Ill.
- Jordon L. Larson — President, American Association of School Superintendents and Superintendent of Schools, Mt. Vernon, N. Y.
- Hugo Leinberger — Minister of Education, Flossmoor Community Church, Flossmoor, Ill.
- Frank A. Lindhorst — Director, Christian Community Administration, College of the Pacific, Stockton, Cal.
- Joseph H. Lookstein — Congregation Kehilath Jeshurun, New York City.
- Louis L. Mann, Rabbi, Chicago Sinai Congregation, Chicago, Ill.
- Donald M. Maynard — Professor, School of Theology, Boston University, Boston, Mass.
- Sister Mary Janet Miller, S.C. — Commission of American Citizenship, Catholic University, Washington, D. C.
- Levi A. Olan — Rabbi, Temple Emanuel, Dallas, Texas.
- Robert Poerschke — Minister of Education, Myers Park Baptist Church, Charlotte, N. C.
- Howard Rubendall — Headmaster, Mt. Hermon School, Mt. Hermon, Mass.
- Erwin Shaver — Director, Department of Weekday Religious Education, National Council of Churches of Christ, Chicago, Ill.
- Seymour Smith — Professor Divinity School, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.
- O. M. Walton — Executive Secretary, Allegheny County of Churches, Pittsburgh, Pa.
- Frank T. Wilson — Dean, School of Religion, Howard University, Washington, D. C.
- Kenneth S. Wills — Department of Christian Education of the Canadian Council of Churches, Toronto, Canada.
- Wendell Yeo — Academic Vice-President, Boston University.

REGIONAL DIRECTORS (Area Chairmen)

- New England — Ernest W. Kuebler, American Unitarian Association, Boston, Mass.
- Tri-State — Lawrence C. Little, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pa.
- Southeast — Myron T. Hopper, College of Bible, Lexington, Ky.
- Lake Michigan — Leon Fram, Rabbi, Temple Israel, Detroit 2.
- Southwest-Rocky Mountain — James Seehorn Senecker, Southern Methodist University, Dallas, Tex.
- Pacific — Stewart G. Cole, Educational Director, National Conference of Christians and Jews, Los Angeles, Calif.

(The Officers, Standing Committee Chairmen and the Regional Directors
are also Members of Board of Directors)